Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BV4501 .P4
Peabody, Francis Greenwood MAIN
Religious education of an American citiz
3 9967 00218 4328

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T5-BCG-459

# THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

# THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

BY

FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY
Plummer Professor of Christian Morals (Emeritus)
in Harvard University

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1918

*All rights reserved*

12991

COPYRIGHT, 1917
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped. Published, June, 1917.
Reprinted February, 1918.

BV4501
.P4

## NOW WE SEE IN A MIRROR BUT THEN FACE TO FACE

I DO NOT DOUBT, DEAR WIFE, THAT WE SHALL PROVE
SOMEWHERE, SOMEHOW, THE TIMELESSNESS OF LOVE;
THAT, THROUGH THE LABYRINTH OF TIME AND SPACE,
I SHALL BE LED TO SEE YOU FACE TO FACE;
AND, SEEKING PEACE, SHALL, WITH A GLAD SURPRISE,
FIND IT, AS EVER, IN YOUR PEACEFUL EYES.
YET, FROM THESE HOPES, UNREALIZED THOUGH SWEET,
WHICH BECKON AND ALLURE, BUT STILL RETREAT,
I TURN TO SEE THEIR IMAGE STANDING FAST
UPON THE UNCLOUDED MIRROR OF THE PAST.
I SEE YOU THERE, CONSOLING, PATIENT, KIND,
TO FAULTS FORGIVING AND TO FOLLIES BLIND;
I WATCH YOU THERE, THROUGH BUSY WORKS AND DAYS,
UNMOVED BY THANKLESSNESS, UNSPOILED BY PRAISE;
MOST HAPPY WHEN MOST SILENT AND UNSEEN,
YET IN THE WORLD SAGACIOUS AND SERENE,
AND WINNING THE BEHOLDER TO CONFESS
THE CONQUERING CHARM OF SELF-FORGETFULNESS.
I SEE YOU STILL ABOVE YOUR FLOWERS BEND,
EACH SHOOT TO STRAIGHTEN AND EACH BUD TO TEND;
UNTIL, AS BY PERSUASION FROM ABOVE,
YOUR GARDEN YIELDS ITS ANSWER TO YOUR LOVE.
AND, STANDING BY YOUR SIDE, I DIMLY SEE
THE SON OF MAN IN HIS BENIGNITY,
TRAINING YOUR WILL, AS YOU HAVE TRAINED YOUR FLOWERS,
TO BEAR LIFE'S CHILLING STORMS AND SULTRY HOURS;
AND SMILING AS HE SEES THE UNCONSCIOUS GRACE
WHICH SHYLY LIFTS ITSELF TO MEET HIS FACE.
IF IN THE MAGIC MIRROR OF OUR LIFE
SUCH IMAGES REMAIN, BELOVED WIFE;
IF TWO WILLS, MADE SO DIVERSE, GREW TO BE
MIRACULOUSLY MERGED IN UNITY;
IF ON MY MEMORY SINKS THIS CLOUDLESS SUN,
AND HAPPY YEARS DEFY OBLIVION;
IF I HAVE HAD THIS GLIMPSE THROUGH HEAVEN'S GATE,
SHALL I NOT PATIENTLY BELIEVE, AND WAIT?

# INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The purpose of this series of loosely connected chapters is to call attention to some of the influences which direct, and some of the qualities which mark, the religious education of an American citizen. The normal life of an American proceeds from childhood to youth and from youth to manhood, through the shifting environments of home, school, college, business, citizenship and Church; and at each step he is met by conditions and demands which may either promote or obstruct his religious education. What, then, are the circumstances which are likely to be most favorable for a healthy-minded and progressive religious experience? What can be done by parents, teachers, employers, statesmen, or pastors, to reinforce American citizenship with a rational religious life? What are the special obstacles which American civilization offers to religious progress? What are the traits of the American character on which teachers of religion may most confidently depend?

These questions lead one quite beyond the region of technical administration or ecclesias-

tical authority. They are not concerned with catechisms, or Sunday-schools, or Church membership. All this mechanism of organization and instruction, indispensable though it is, assumes a susceptibility in pupils or in converts to religious motives, a responsiveness to religious truth, a thirst for the living God, a restlessness of human nature until it finds rest in Him. The mechanism is designed to utilize and convey spiritual power, to develope and direct instead of checking or wasting it, and the invention and regulation of such machinery is the business of religious engineers. But the power itself, as it flows from the high places of human experience down to the plains of daily life, is the essential prerequisite of effective engineering, the source of that energy which turns the wheels of the Church. How to conserve that force, how to store it at its remote and hidden sources, how to keep it clear from taint and secure its abundant and unobstructed flow,—this is the problem of religious education. It lies, as it were, higher up among the hills of life than any determination of doctrinal conformity or ecclesiastical practices, and on its vitality and force the efficiency of these operations must ultimately depend.

These considerations lead one to explore, in

one and another direction, the conditions and institutions of American life among which the stream of religious experience has its origin, and from which its course must be directed. How shall these influences be so cleansed and freed from obstruction that the water of life may flow freely down? Can the inevitable circumstances of American citizenship be made a purified medium of religious education? What are the defects, and what are the virtues of the American character of which religious teaching should take account? These are questions to which answers are at the present time eagerly and even feverishly sought by many thoughtful minds. In the following Papers, occasional for the most part in their origin and fragmentary in their form, it is not pretended that this high task of interpretation is fulfilled. They represent nothing more than exploratory excursions which, as on some tramp among the hills, may find here and there a living spring, and clear away some of the rubbish which checks it, leaving the current unimpeded and free. It is for the more expert hands of theological engineers to harness the stream into their enterprises and to convert incidental observations into systematic schemes.

# CONTENTS

PAGE

Introductory Note . . . . . vii

CHAPTER I

The Religious Education of an American Child . . 1

CHAPTER II

The American Boy and His Home . . . . . 18

CHAPTER III

The Religion of a College Student . . . . . 31

CHAPTER IV

The Universities and the Social Conscience . . . 56

CHAPTER V

The Religious Education of an American Citizen . 74

CHAPTER VI

The American Character . . . . . 93

CHAPTER VII

Discipline . . . . . 110

CHAPTER VIII

Power . . . . . 123

CHAPTER IX

Perspective . . . . . 141

Contents

CHAPTER X PAGE

The Expansion of Religion . . . . . 158

CHAPTER XI

The Conversion of Militarism . . . . . 174

CHAPTER XII

The Place of Jesus Christ in a Religious Experience . 196

# THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

## I

### THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN CHILD

WHAT, to begin at the beginning, are the circumstances and principles which should be recalled in undertaking the religious education of an American child? The question does not have in mind either the theological education of a sceptical child, or the catechetical education of a restless child, or the moral education of a wayward child, or the eugenic education of an unsymmetrical child, however important and timely all these pedagogical enterprises may be. These types of education are amply, even if not judiciously, provided for. The catechisms enumerate to children the terms of salvation and the contents of Scripture; the discipline of schools, churches, homes, laws and customs promotes moral conformity, even if not moral

initiative; and the laws of health, hygiene, and heredity, even if not scrupulously obeyed, are at least widely understood. Religious education, however, is not primarily concerned either with the order of Old Testament books, or with the travels of Paul, or with good manners and social propriety, or with the raising of better stocks by physical selection and stall-fed virtue. It is concerned, on the one hand, with religion, and with religion not as doctrine or conformity, but as the conscious association of a human soul with the will of God; and it is concerned, on the other hand, with education, and with education not as instruction, or the building up of a structure of beliefs, but as the "educing," or drawing out, as the word implies, the latent faculties of the child into consciousness and efficiency. It assumes, in other words, that a normal child has in him the germ of a religious nature; that he is not a child of wrath, "conceived and born in sin," and regenerated through baptism, but a child of grace, to whom it is as natural under favoring circumstances to be religious as it is for a flower in a garden to bloom, and whose capacities and tendencies Jesus rightly interpreted when he told his disciples that unless they became as little children they could not enter the Kingdom of Heaven. The problem

of religious education, therefore, is that of providing a soil, climate, and nurture which may "educe" this natural growth, and of removing the accumulation of artificiality, unreality, and rubbish which may hinder this natural evolution.

To this general problem of religious education is further added its special application to the American child. There are, of course, many kinds of children in the United States, and different circumstances call for diversity and flexibility in education. But precisely as there has issued from this melting-pot of the nations a kind of citizen which is recognizable as the American type, so there is discernible behind all diversities of race, color, urban and rural life, economic prosperity and want, a normal and typical child whom the institutions and conditions of American life tend to produce. This typical child is bred neither in luxury nor in destitution; it is neither illiterate nor highly cultivated; it is neither depraved nor perfect; neither a tough nor a saint. It represents those millions of children who have been born and reared in the average, bread-winning, and self-respecting American homes, and taught in the common schools; who have attended the neighboring church, are unspoiled by indulg-

ence and unafraid of work, inclined to self-confidence and expectancy — in short, scions of the stock which has been grafted from many nations but has become rooted in the soil of the United States, and from which the great majority of our national leaders have sprung. How shall this American child, the normal product of American democracy, the child of a free school and a voluntary church, acquire a religious education? How shall the natural adaptation of its character to the sense of dependence, reverence and communion be nurtured and drawn out? How shall it be saved from the conception of religion as an external, artificial and superimposed restraint, and become habitually conscious of a spiritual universe with a purpose in it for the child's own life? In a word, how shall the American child grow progressively more conscious of the life of God in the soul of man, and approach that simplicity — or, as the Greek suggests, that single-mindedness — which is "toward Christ"?

The answer to these questions must be first approached by recognizing that the religious education of an American child begins much earlier in the child's life than most parents are apt to suppose. Many people regard the first

intimations of awe or adoration which their children express as amusing evidences of precocity or imaginativeness, and passively await the time when through the suggestion of their pastor or through their own sense of fitness they may be moved to send their child to Sunday-school, where his religious education shall begin. The fact is, however, that the evolution or repression of the religious instinct has by that time been for years affected by the habits of the home, by the conduct of parents, by the tone and temper of family life, so that impulses and tendencies have been already promoted or checked, as a lingering winter retards, or a hastening spring persuades, the timid flowers. Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes once playfully said that the discipline of one's physical constitution should begin with the wise selection of one's grandparents; and it is not less certain that the religious education of a child is inseparable from the habitual conduct of parental life. If religion be postponed until it seem needed as an example; if levity, frivolity or carelessness rule the conversation or taste of the home; if days and nights be preoccupied with money-making and money-spending and the care of children delegated to hired guardians; then it should be no surprise that teachers and preach-

ers find it difficult to make the spiritual life seem real or near, and that religion seems to children, as to their parents, an external form, rather than a personal experience. In short, the earliest communication of religion to a child is accomplished not by instruction but by contagion. Its approach is not didactic but atmospheric; and the instincts and motives which even in maturity may prove most ineradicable and persuasive are likely to be those which have been unconsciously appropriated in the spiritual climate of a reverent and loving home. The problem of the child, in brief, is but one aspect of the problem of the family; and the preservation of integrity and coherence in that unit of civilization provides the most fundamental problem of the modern world. "God setteth the solitary," it is written, "in families"; and that initial association into which the child by the conditions of human parentage and birth must enter, will be to him either the best of human blessings or the most threatening of perils for his faith.

To this period of unconscious assimilation, which is like the prenatal period in its effect on the future of the child, there succeeds a second period of conscious instruction and discipline. Where shall such instruction begin? At what

point does the religious nature of the child naturally bloom, as a spring flower breaks through the crust of sod? Here we meet the most persistent blunder of the churches in their conduct of religious education. Along with their habitual rendering of religion into terms of dogma, conformity and assent, has come the still more preposterous notion that the same intellectualizing process is desirable, or even possible, for the child. Instruction in religion has begun, as a rule, either with subjects of doctrine or with subjects of history. An orthodox opinion concerning the nature of God and Christ, or a store of information about the Bible and the Church, or both, have as a rule made the material of catechisms and lessons. Much intellectual profit may no doubt be gained from these acquisitions; and it is one of the misfortunes of modern life that so many children are pitifully uninformed about Christian thought and Christian literature. But it must be remembered that a child may be thoroughly instructed both in Christian doctrine and in Christian history and yet have acquired no religious education at all. A child may repeat without a slip all the articles of the Apostles' Creed without being saved thereby from a slip of character. A child may know the order of

all the Epistles in the New Testament without becoming what the Apostle calls an Epistle of Christ, written with the spirit of the living God. In other words, information is not inspiration; creeds do not insure character; and religion is not orthodoxy but life.

To this obvious fact should be further added the not less significant truth that this catechetical and theological approach to religious education fails to reach the real child. This is not the point where the nature of the child for the present happens to be. The child is neither a Nicene metaphysician nor a Biblical critic. When the catechism asks him, "What dost thou chiefly learn in these Articles of thy Belief?" and he answers, "I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me and all the world; and in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind; and in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the elect people of God"; or when in answer to the question, "What are the decrees of God?" he is instructed to reply, "The decrees of God are His eternal purpose according to the counsel of His will, whereby, for His own glory, He hath foreordained whatsoever cometh to pass," the child is unquestionably announcing some of the sublimest conceptions of the universe which have ever dawned

upon the mind of man; yet it is obvious that they must be for the present remote and unassimilated conceptions. What may be tremendously real to the trained theologian becomes sheer sonorous phrases to the unsophisticated child. The best that can be thus achieved is the consent of ignorance and the mimicry of maturity. The child's nature is poetic, dramatic, imaginative; and it is as little at home in the rigidity of dogma or the regulations of ecclesiasticism as is a thrush in a cage.

Where, then, must religious education begin? It must begin where the child's nature happens to be. The psychology of childhood is the key to instruction. Association with the highest, intimacy with excellence, a habit of mind induced by companionship with the Good, the Beautiful, and the True,— these well-proved processes of psychological operation wake and kindle the susceptible nature of the child to warmth and utterance. In other words, religious education should begin with religion itself rather than with the interpretation and explanation of religion. A hymn may speak to the child's nature while a catechism is dumb. The Twenty-third Psalm and the story of the Prodigal Son may create real pictures in his mind, while the creeds and the sacraments are still seen through

a glass darkly. The same Jesus to whom little children nestled and who took them in his arms, still says to parents and teachers, "Suffer the little children to come unto me," even while the mysterious problems of his nature and office may be unexplored and even unimagined by the child. Let the child, therefore, learn, not by rote only but by heart, the purest lyrical utterances of the religious life. Let him be at home among the great sayings and doings of Jesus, as one whose own home is hung round with pictures of those scenes which, even before he can interpret them, arrest his reverent gaze; and this association with the best may remain for him a more permanent guide and restraint than the most irrefutable arguments of dogma or the most unquestioning acceptance of conformity. Out of the heart, it is written, come the issues of life; and many a life has been sustained in the emergencies and crises of the world, not so much by the creed which it has accepted, as by the survival of emotions and instincts, and even of phrases or verses, which re-awaken the associations and faith of a little child.

Religious education, however, though it should begin with the religious nature of the child, must proceed to the interpretation and justification of that primary experience. The

first conditions of growth for a flower are those of soil and sunshine; but the time arrives when the shoot which emerges from the ground must adapt itself to the world in which it is to live. It is the same with the soul of the child. Problems of thought and of duty soon confront this emerging experience; and it must be trained to a fruitful growth and rendered fit to survive. What, then, are the further principles which should direct religious education as it thus watches and tends this expanding life?

The first principle is Reality. This does not mean that there should be nothing left for later experiences to explore or for richer insight to interpret; but that the evidence offered and the conviction encouraged should be, so far as they go, genuine, reasonable, and unconstrained. To overload the young mind with a cargo of doctrine is to lose religious buoyancy and to be at the mercy of spiritual storms. A wise education begins with the near, the obvious and the verifiable. It subordinates completeness to reality. It does not urge on the child what is unreal to the teacher. Its attitude to the child is that of undisguised sincerity. It is concerned not so much with conformity as with consistency. One truth realized is more convincing than a whole system of theology unassimilated. One

aspect of nature, one glimpse of God, one teaching of Christ, one lesson of experience, if it be real, is enough to steady the will as it makes its way to firmer loyalty. Religious education, in other words, is qualitative rather than quantitative. When a man in the oil-regions sinks a shaft, it is enough if at any one point he strikes a supply. One flowing well is a fortune. Out of its depths gushes so ample a yield that his further problem is not to sink more wells, but to find storage for his blazing wealth. It is the same when one strikes truth. One well of truth makes a mind rich. Out of its depth flow the interpretations and consolations of experience, and a judicious education sets itself to store this wealth just as it comes, and to generate from it the light and warmth which it is able to supply.

The second principle of this riper education is Personality. Among the many blunders of a systematized and authoritative education in religion is its uniformity, its pre-established method, its lack of flexibility, its impersonal character. Religious experience is given a prescribed form; conversion assumes a uniform type; a twice-born nature is regarded as more devout than a once-born soul; education, in the church as in the school, standardizes mediocrity

instead of exalting initiative. Over against all this mechanism of education stands the principle of personality. To take a life as it is and make of it what it was meant to be — to discern the potential qualities of different lives, their animal spirits, their temperamental tendencies, their points of reaction and responsibility, and to draw out the latent possibilities of consecration or endeavour — that is the infinitely varied and perplexing, yet fascinating, task which parents, pastors, and teachers have to meet. Each personality offers a new problem. Each character, however imperfect or headstrong it may be, has its own way of approach to God. One life must be converted, or turned round, by an abrupt revolution in its controlling aim. Another may be led straight along the way it was unconsciously going. There is no more a fixed scale of merit for the growth of character than for the diversity of blossoms into which a garden blooms. Some lives, like that of Paul, must be twice-born; some souls, like that of Jesus, exhibit a continuous, unrevolutionized, and once-born experience. Some must be struck down by the sudden illumination of a flash from heaven, and others may "increase in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and men." To take a person and make of him a personal-

ity,— that is the aim of religious, as of all, education.

It is no small encouragement to observe that this respect for personality marked the habitual teaching of Jesus Christ. His immediate followers were of very varied and not altogether perfect types; but Jesus took them just as they were, and by his faith in each drew out from each the personality which was latent within. The affectionate John and the sceptical Thomas were not made alike, but both were made what neither had imagined that he could be. Even the fickle-minded and wavering Peter, whose character was more like shifting sand than solid rock, found himself trusted and leaned on as one whose name fitted his nature, until under the pedagogical guidance of his great Teacher the sand of character actually hardened into sandstone, and Peter became the rock which Jesus said he could be. It is the same with Christian education still. It sets the personality of youth face to face with the personality of Jesus Christ and trusts the operation of spiritual law to convert softness into strength, cowardice into courage, and sand into rock.

Finally, there remains the principle which gives to religious education its special adaptation to American life, and applies it to the spe-

cific case of the American child. It is the principle of Democracy. Whatever may be said of the method of authority in religion or in politics, and however difficult it may be under a feudal or aristocratic or military system to regard religion as free, personal, and spiritual, a country where liberty and equality are the very air one breathes cannot be a favorable soil for an exotic, imported, or dictatorial faith. The American child, whom we began by describing, is constitutionally free in his habit of mind, intolerant of dictation, inquisitive of reasons and causes, looking forward rather than back. Aristocracy in religion, as in social life, may be attractive to the few who have become, through travel or training, practically Europeanized in taste; but for the many millions who have been bred in the democracy of American institutions, or who have fled from the feudalism of other lands, nothing less than a fraternal, simple, unpretentious, rational, and democratic religion can offer any commanding appeal. Hierarchies, absolutism, State churches with their dignitaries and diplomacy, are as foreign to the American mind as are autocratic and military systems of government. If religion is to command the loyalty of young people to whom free inquiry, the right of private judgment, and the

consent of the governed, make the foundations of political life, teachers of religion, however dearly they may prize the organizations to which they belong, must subordinate conformity to conscience, dictation to inspiration, the Church to the soul, and must promote a religious experience which is consistent with every rational desire of a spiritual democracy.

Under these principles of Reality, Personality, and Democracy, the religious education of an American child becomes a natural process, which it is a privilege to direct and a joy to recall. It begins with the near, the practical and the real; it proceeds through diversities of administration in the one spirit; and it ends in a religion which is in harmony with citizenship, with science, and with the experience of life. It begins with the self-discipline of the parents; it proceeds through the discovery of God's intention for the child; and it is confirmed by the reverence for personality and the confidence in spiritual democracy which mark the teaching of Jesus Christ. The sower of such an education may go forth to sow with the confident step of one who is a laborer together with God; and though some of his seed may fall on stony places where there is not much depth of earth,

the field where he lavishly scatters may surprise him with its fertility, and the sun and soil may conspire with his service to bring forth thirty- or sixty- or a hundred-fold.

## II

### THE AMERICAN BOY AND HIS HOME

THE first thing to say about the problem of the American Boy is that it is a part of the problem of the American Home. Behind all the suggestions which are now so freely made concerning the training, duties, opportunities, and temptations of boys, there stands always in the background the larger question of domestic integrity, unity, and permanence. The problem of the family is the *crux* of modern civilization. When one examines, for instance, the programme of industrial revolution, with its economic propositions concerning the control of property, he may be startled to find that this revolution in property-holding involves a not less revolutionary change in the domestic relations, and that the storm-centre of this economic transition is likely to be found in the apparently remote and unrelated problem of the family. Or again, if one undertakes some work of charity — the relief of destitution, it may be, or the building of improved dwellings — he finds his special form of service inevitably correlated

with the problem of the home. How to hold the family together when the bread-winner dies or deserts; how to insure reasonable privacy for the family under the conditions of tenement-life — these are questions which confront modern philanthropy and social legislation every day. The family is not only, as has been often said, the unit of civilization; it is also the test of civilization. The stability and persistence of any nation or race is in proportion to the integrity and coherence of its family group.

Here, then, is the fundamental fact about a boy. A good boy is the natural product of a good home; and all the efforts of philanthropy to make boys better by wholesale schemes of education or recreation are but imperfect substitutes for the work and play which are the spontaneous products of a healthy-minded home. The professional "worker" among boys is like a physician called to visit a child, who administers to his little patient tonics, drugs, and exercises, while all the time aware that these prescriptions, however serviceable they may be, are but substitutes for the fresh air, good food, and simple living which the child should have had in its home to fortify its life against weakness and disease.

At this point, then, we come upon the great

and overshadowing peril of a boy's life. It is not, as many suppose, his bad companions or his bad books or his bad habits; it is the peril of homelessness. Homelessness is not merely house-lessness,— the having no bed or room which can be called one's own. It is the isolation of the boy's soul; the lack of some one to listen to him; a life without roots which hold him in his place and make him grow. This is what drives the boy into the arms of evil, and makes the street his home and the gang his family; or else drives him in upon himself with uncommunicated imaginings and feverish desires. Such a boyhood verifies that experience of which Jesus spoke, where a life was like an empty house, and precisely because it was empty there entered seven devils where one had dwelt before, and the last state of that man was worse than the first. If there is one thing with which a boy cannot be trusted alone, it is himself. He is by nature a gregarious animal; and if the group which nature provides for him is denied, then he gives himself to any group which may solicit. A boy, like all things in nature, abhors a vacuum; and if his home be a vacuum of lovelessness, then he abhors his home.

This risk of homelessness is, however, not run by poor boys only. There is, of course, a

type of poverty which necessarily involves homelessness,— the life of the street-Arab or the tramp. Yet, in the vast majority of humble homes one of the most conspicuous and beautiful traits to be observed is the strength of family affection, resisting every kind of strain,— the wife clinging to her drunken husband, or the parents protecting their wayward son even against the advice of a judge upon the bench. On the other hand, an increasing risk which many prosperous families encounter is the tendency to homelessness, the temptations of the nomadic life, as though a home were a tent which one might fold "like the Arabs, and as silently steal away"; the slackening of domestic responsibility through the habit of transient residence in boarding-houses or hotels as refuges from the cares of a home.

The fact is that between some boys of the most prosperous and some of the least prosperous type there exists a curious and often unrecognized likeness of condition. Both may run grave risk of homelessness; and what should be domestic life to them may become a shifting and temporary incident. Rich parents may be so completely preoccupied with money-making or money-spending, that their home becomes little more than a sleeping-place;

and poor parents may, though with better reason, be separated from their children from early morning till late evening by the necessities of bread-winning at the factory or shop. In either case of homelessness, therefore, there is the same necessity for finding some substitute for a home. For the homeless children of the poor, philanthropy has devised a Placing-out System, which deports boys from the homelessness of a city to domestic life in rural communities. For the homeless children of the rich a similar Placing-out System has been provided by the establishment of boarding-schools, where devoted and intelligent teachers accept the parental responsibilities which overburdened or self-indulgent parents decline.

There are, it must be recognized, many circumstances of duty or occupation in the complexity and migratoriness of modern life which make it necessary for parents to live where it is not expedient for boys to be, and which therefore may compel this delegation of parental privilege. Yet, admitting these important exceptions, it is evident that the general consent of prosperous parents to commit to school-masters the training of boys in the most critical and formative years of life indicates in many homes either a distrust of parental capacity to rear children,

or a subordination of the care of children to other interests of social life. Much may be gained by this system of delegated parenthood. A boy is likely to acquire in his boarding-school a sound body, a passion for athletics, a fine sense of manly honor, congenial companionships, and even, under skilful teachers, some taste for study; but it is not improbable that he may miss something of the considerateness and self-sacrifice which are the natural products of the intimacy, discipline, and even friction of a judicious and affectionate home.

If, therefore, a boy is normally the product of a home, what kind of American home is likely to make the right kind of American boy? There are, it would seem, three characteristics which a boy must recognize before he will think of his home as good, and which, if he does recognize them as marks of his own home, will make him remember that home as the most precious of his moral inheritances. The first of these characteristics is Simplicity. Simplicity, however, does not mean meagreness, or emptiness, or lack of comfort, or even the absence of luxuries. Some good homes are luxurious, and some are bare; and bad homes may be found among both poor and rich. Simplicity is the opposite of complexity; and the home

which is blessed with simplicity is an uncomplicated and single-minded home, free from divisive interests and conflicting desires, finding its happiness in common sympathies and joys. A simple home, that is to say, is simply a home; not a step to something else, not an instrument of social ambition, not a mere sleeping-place, like a kennel into which a dog creeps for the night; but a centre of affectionate self-denial and mutual forbearance; an end in itself, as though the main concern for a family were simply to make a home and to keep it simple. When a boy discovers that his parents find their satisfaction elsewhere than in the home,— in the club of the prosperous or in the saloon of the poor — then the boy also will follow the group-instinct as it leads him to the street or the gang; in so far as he sees the home satisfying his parents, it is likely to satisfy him.

The second mark of a good home is Consistency. The parental discipline of the home is to be chiefly maintained, not by precepts, but by the consistent conduct of the parents themselves. A boy is not easily moved by exhortation, but he is affected with extraordinary ease by contagion. A boy is in many points immature and unobservant, but one trait in him is highly developed,— the capacity to detect anything that

looks like humbug. If he observe any considerable inconsistency between precept and example, between exhortation and character, all the well-intended efforts of his home are likely to be in vain. Nothing is more contagious than a consistent life. We hear much of the self-propagating nature of disease and sin, but these ills which are contrary to nature are by no means so easily transmitted as is the contagion of goodness. No greater mistake can be made by parents than to fancy that a boy is naturally inclined to go wrong; and no mistake is so likely to make a boy go where he is expected to go. The fact is that anything is natural to a boy. He can be bent crooked or kept straight like a growing bough; and the chief reason why goodness does not appear to him more tempting than sin is that goodness is seldom made so interesting, picturesque, or heroic as sin. In the Oriental picture of the shepherd and the sheep in the Fourth Gospel, the shepherd goes before and the sheep hear his voice and follow him. That is the only way to be a shepherd of boys. They are hard cattle to drive, but easy to lead. There is nothing they like better than a consistent, single-minded, straight-going leader, and when they hear his voice they follow him.

Out of the simplicity and consistency of a good home issues its third characteristic. It is that relation between children and their parents whose historical name is Piety. The word has not only become involved in religious implications, but also carries with it a suggestion of unreality, formalism, ostentation, or pretence. A pious person is apt to seem to a healthy-minded boy an artificial or sentimental creature. Yet Piety, in its Latin usage, was the name for the duty and loyalty of a child to its parents, or of a wife to her husband. Æneas, in Virgil, was called pious because he was a good son of Anchises. Piety toward God is, therefore, nothing else than the affection of a son translated into a religious experience. Man, as Jesus taught, is a child of God, and turns to God just as a human child turns to his father with loyalty and love. When the Prodigal Son comes to himself, he says, "I will arise and go to my Father." Religion, that is to say, regards the universe as a home; and duty conceived as loyalty to God becomes Piety.

This, then, is the American home which makes the right kind of American boy,— a home where simplicity and consistency open into piety; where a boy thinks of his father not as a drill-master or fault-finder, so that the first in-

stinct of the boy is to keep out of the way; or of his mother as yielding a fragment of her day to her children, while committing their nurture for the most part to hired experts; but of both parents as comrades to whom it is a happiness to go, and as advisers from whom it is safe to learn. As the course of experience broadens with the years, and the problems and temptations of maturity confront the man who was once a boy, he looks back on these parents and this home with a piety which needs little expansion to become a part of his religion, and finds in that retreating reminiscence of his boyhood the most convincing picture which he can frame of the discipline and watchfulness of God. In a most profound and searching sense the prayer of Wordsworth is answered in the experiences of his life:

> "The child is father of the man,
> And I could wish my days to be
> Bound each to each by natural piety."

Under what conditions is this relationship of domestic piety most naturally attained? Is it one of the perquisites of prosperity, so that those to whom much has been given have added to them this further blessing? Or is it, on the other hand, a region of the Kingdom of Heaven

which they who have riches may hardly enter? Fortunately for American life no such fixed relation exists between condition and character. Prosperity may be as free from complexity, inconsistency, and impiety as is poverty; and poverty may by its overwhelming weight repress affection and joy. Yet, on the whole, the special privilege of domestic intimacy, with its parental satisfactions and its filial piety, is more accessible in modest and unambitious homes than among the complex and divisive interests of luxurious conditions. This is one of the facts of civilization which go far to atone for inequality of economic opportunity. Wealth may bring to a home many advantages, but the problem of the American boy is certainly harder to meet where sacrifices are not demanded and self-indulgence is not prohibited. The home which is most likely to produce the best kind of boy — and the type of home from which, in fact, the vast majority of effective American citizens have sprung — is where plain conditions, hard work, and mutual sacrifices have stiffened the will, softened the affections, and prompted that simplicity, consistency, and piety which are as precious possessions to a man as to a boy.

At this point, then, the problem of the American boy becomes merged in the larger problem

of the American character. What the boy is to become is in the main determined by the prevailing habits, customs, and standards of American life. Miss Jane Addams, with her habitual insight, once said of social service: "We cannot do much for the poor; we can only do things with the poor." The saying is not less true of boys. We cannot do much for boys; we can only do things with them. The first problem set before a parent is not to make his boy good, but to make himself what he wants his boy to become. The first condition of doing good is being good. Filial piety is the corollary of parental wisdom. The dominant note of the American character is repeated in shriller tones by the American boy.

And how is this preliminary obligation of parental fitness to be met? It is most naturally met by accepting to its full the reaction of the boy on the life that wants to help the boy. The boy has as much to teach as he has to learn. Each demand laid on the parent to advise or correct the boy is at the same time a demand laid on the parent to test his own character. To desire that one's boy shall be unstained and healthy-minded is to be pledged to the same law of life. However much one may fail in parental wisdom, it is far worse to prac-

tise parental hypocrisy. He must, therefore, so far as grace is given him, be what he prays that his son may be. His boy is a mirror in which he sees himself. The most poignant sorrow which he can imagine or endure would not be the perdition of his own soul, but the inheritance or contagion of his own sin reproduced in his own son; and the most justifiable and permanent happiness which can be his, in this world or another, would be derived from the assurance that his boy may legitimately trace his health of body and his strength of will to the influences of his boyhood's home.

# III

## THE RELIGION OF A COLLEGE STUDENT

THE American youth, whose spiritual evolution we are tracing, passes from the period of childhood and the environment of home into the more complex and confusing conditions of his maturer life. He may proceed either to the privilege of further education at a College or University, or more directly to the responsibilities and circumstances of business life. In each of these riper experiences he is met again by the problem of spiritual discipline; and each of these social types has its part in the religious education of American citizens.

Let us follow, first, the boy as he goes to college, and consider how far he may reasonably expect that his religious life may there be steadied and enriched. Many appeals have been made to the college student concerning his duty to religion. He should be, it is urged, a more constant attendant at worship; he should commit himself more openly to religious loyalty; he should guard himself against the infidelity and

indecision which attack him with subtle strategy under the conditions of college life. May it not be of advantage, however, to consider this relationship from the opposite point of view and to inquire what religion on its side must offer in order to meet the needs of an educated young man? What has a young man the right to ask as a condition of his loyalty? What is there which the Christian Church must learn concerning the character and ideals of a normal, educated, modern youth before it can hope to lead the heart of such a youth to an unconstrained obedience? What is the religion of a college student?

There are, of course, certain limitations in such an inquiry. We must assume on both sides open-mindedness, teachableness, seriousness, and good faith. We cannot take into account either a foolish student or a foolish church. There are, on the one hand, some youths of the college-age whom no conceivable adaptation of religious teaching can hope to reach. They are self-absorbed, self-conscious, self-satisfied, self-conceited. There is little that the Church can do for them but to pray that, as they grow older, they may grow more humble, and, therefore, more teachable. On the other hand, there are some methods of re-

ligious activity which cannot reasonably anticipate the co-operation of educated men. Here and there an imaginative young person may be won by emotional appeals or ecclesiastical picturesqueness; but the normal type of thoughtful youth demands of religious teaching soberness, intellectual satisfaction, and reasonable claims. We must dismiss from consideration both the unreasoning youth and the unreasonable Church. We set before ourselves, on the one hand, an alert, open-minded, well-trained youth, looking out with eager eyes into the mystery of the universe; and, on the other hand, a thoughtful, candid, sensible Church, resting its claim not on tradition or passion, but on its perception and maintenance of verifiable truth. How shall these two factors of modern life — the chief factors of its future stability — the life of thoughtful youth and the truth of the Christian religion, come to know and help each other; and what are the traits of Christian teaching which must be unmistakably recognized before it can commend itself to a young student in a modern world?

To these questions it must be answered, first of all, that the religion of a college student must satisfy that passion which, as has been indicated, is felt even in childhood, but which

becomes more confirmed in youth, for Reality. No effort of the Church is more misdirected than the attempt to win the loyalty of intelligent young people by multiplying the accessories or incidentals of the religious life — its ecclesiastical embellishments or its provision for sociability. The modern college student, while in many respects very immature, is extraordinarily alert in his discernment of anything which seems to him of the nature of strategy or diplomacy. The first demand he makes either of companions or teachers is the demand for sincerity, straightforwardness, reality. He is not likely to be won to the Christian life by external persuasions laboriously planned "to draw in young people," or to assure them that religion is a companionable and pleasant thing. These incidental activities of the Church have their unquestioned place as expressions of Christian sentiment and service, but they are misapplied when utilized as decoys. They are corollaries of religious experience, not preliminaries of it; they are what one wants to do when he is a Christian; not what makes a thoughtful man believe in Christ. The modern young man sees these things just as they are. Indeed, he is inclined to be on his guard against them. He will nibble at the bait, but he will not take the

hook. He will consume the refreshments of the Church, serve on its committees, enjoy its æsthetic effects, while still withholding himself from the personal consecration which these were designed to induce. He will accept no substitute for reality. He wants the best. He is not old enough to be diffident or circuitous in his desires; he does not linger in the outer courts of truth; he marches straight into the Holy of Holies, and lifts the veil from the central mystery. The Church may fail of its mission to the student because it imagines him to be frivolous and indifferent, when in fact he is tremendously in earnest and passionately sincere.

And suppose, on the other hand, that the Church meets this candid creature just where he is, and, instead of offering him accessories and incidentals as adapted to his frivolous mind, presents to him, with unadorned and sober reasonableness, the realities of religion, what discovery is the Church then likely to make? It may discover, to its own surprise, and often to the surprise of the youth himself, an unanticipated susceptibility in him to religious reality, and a singular freshness and vitality of religious experience. Many people imagine that the years from seventeen to twenty-two are not likely to be years of natural piety. The world,

it is urged, is just making its appeal to the flesh and to the mind with overmastering power, while the experience of life has not yet created for itself a stable religion. Thirty years ago it was determined in Harvard University that religion should be no longer regarded as a part of academic discipline but should be offered to youth as a privilege and opportunity. It was at that time argued by at least one learned person that the system was sure to fail, because, by the very conditions of their age, young men were unsusceptible to religion. They had outgrown, he urged, the religion of their childhood, and had not yet grown into the religion of their maturity; so that a plan which rested on faith in the inherent religiousness of young men was doomed to disappointment. If, however, the voluntary system of religion applied to university life has proved anything in these thirty years, it has proved the essentially religious nature of the normal, educated young American. To offer religion, not as an obligation of college life, but as its supreme privilege, was an act of faith in young men. It assumed that when religion was honestly and intelligently presented to the mind of youth it would receive a reverent and responsive recognition.

The happy issue of this bold undertaking

has serious lessons for religious teachers. It disposes altogether of the meagre expectation with which the life of youth is frequently regarded. A preacher, addressing a college audience, once announced that just as childhood was assailed by so many infantile diseases that it was surprising to see any child grow up, so youth was assailed by so many sins that it was surprising to see any young man grow up unstained. There is no rational basis for this enervating scepticism. The fact is that it is natural for a young man to be good, just as it is natural for a child to grow up. A much wiser word was spoken by a beloved scholar, who, being invited to address an audience on the temptations of college life, said that he should consider chiefly its temptations to excellence. A college boy, that is to say, is not, as many suppose, a peculiarly misguided and essentially light-minded person. He is, on the contrary, set in conditions which tempt to excellence, and is peculiarly responsive to every sincere appeal to his higher life. Behind the mask of light-mindedness or self-assertion which he assumes, his interior life is wrestling with fundamental problems, as Jacob wrestled with the angel and would not let it go until it blessed him. "Your young men," said the prophet,

with deep insight into the nature of youth, "shall see visions." They are our natural idealists. The shades of the prison-house of common life have not yet closed about their sense of the romantic, the heroic and the real.

To this susceptibility of youth religious teaching should be addressed. It should believe in a young man even when he does not believe in himself. It should attempt no adaptation of truth to immaturity or indifference. It should assume that a young man, even though he disguise the fact by every subterfuge of modesty or mock defiance, is capable of spiritual vision, and that his secret desire is to have that vision interpreted and prolonged. When Jesus met the young men whom he wanted for his disciples, his first relation with them was one of absolute, and apparently unjustified, confidence. He believed in them and in their spiritual responsiveness. He disclosed to them the secrets of their own hearts. He dismissed accessories and revealed realities. He did not cheapen religion or make small demands. He bade these men leave all and follow him. He took for granted that their nature called for the religion he had to offer, and he gave it to them without qualification or fear. The young men, for whom the accidental aspects of

religion were thus stripped away and its heart laid bare, leaped to meet this revelation of reality. "We have found the Messiah," they told each other. They had been believed in even before they believed in themselves, and that which the new sense of reality disclosed to them as real they at last in reality became.

Such is the first aspect of the religion of the student — its demand for reality. To reach the heart of an educated young man the message of religion must be unequivocal, uncomplicated, genuine, masculine, direct, real. This, however, is but part of a second quality in the religion of educated youth. The teaching of religion to which such a mind will listen must be, still further, consistent with truth as discerned elsewhere. It must involve no partition of life between thinking and believing. It must be, that is to say, a rational religion. The religion of a college student is one expression of his rational life. To say this is not to say that religion must be stripped of mystery or reduced to the level of a natural science in order to commend itself to educated youth. On the contrary, the tendencies of the higher education lead in precisely the opposite direction. They lead to the conviction that all truth, whether approached by the way of science, phi-

losophy, art, or religion, opens before a serious student into a world of mystery, a sense of the Infinite, a spacious region of idealism, where one enters with reverence and awe. Instead of demanding that religion shall be reduced to the level of other knowledge, it will appear to such a student more reasonable to demand that all forms of knowledge shall be lifted into the realm of faith. It is, however, quite another matter to discover in the teaching of religion any fundamental inconsistency with the spirit of research and the method of proof which the student elsewhere candidly accepts; and we may be sure that it is this sense of inconsistency which is the chief source of any reaction from religious influence which may now be observed among educated young men.

Under the voluntary system of religion at Harvard University there is established a meeting-place, known as the Preacher's Room, where the minister conducting morning prayers spends some hours each day in free and unconstrained intimacy with such students as may seek him. This room has witnessed many frank confessions of religious difficulty and denial, and as each member of the Staff of Preachers recalls his experiences at the university he testifies that the most fruitful hours

of his service have been those of confidential conference in the privacy of the Preacher's Room. But if such a counsellor were further called to describe those instances of spiritual bewilderment and helplessness which have seemed to him most pathetic or tragic, he would not hesitate to recall the by no means infrequent cases of young men who had been trained in a conception of religion which had become untenable under the conditions of university life. A restricted denominationalism, a backward-looking ecclesiasticism, an ignorant defiance of Biblical criticism, and, no less emphatically, an intolerant and supercilious liberalism — these habits of mind become simply impossible when a young man finds himself thrown into a world of wide learning, religious liberty, and intellectual hospitality. Then ensues, for many a young mind, a bitter experience of spiritual disillusion and reconstruction. The young man wanders through dry places, seeking rest and finding none; and he cannot even say: "I will return into my house from whence I came out." To go back is impossible, and before him the way is hid. Meantime his loving parents and his anxious pastor observe with trembling his defection from the old ways, deplore the influence of the university upon re-

ligious faith, and pray for a restoration of belief which is as contrary to nature as the restoration of an oak to the acorn from which it grew.

Now, in all this touching experience, where is the gravest blame to be laid? It must, no doubt, be confessed that among the conditions of college life there are some which tend to encourage in a young man a certain pertness and priggishness of mind which make the old ways of faith seem old-fashioned and primitive. Indeed, it seems to some young men that any way of faith is superfluous to a thorough man of the world, such as the average sophomore ought to be. But these cheerful young persons, for whom the past has no lessons, and in whom the new ideal of self-culture has for the moment suppressed the earlier ideals of self-sacrifice or service, are not a type of student life which need be taken seriously. They are the lookers-on of the academic world. The strenuous game of real learning goes on; and these patrons of the strife sit, as it were, along the side-lines and wear the college colors, but do not participate in the training or the victory. Let us turn to that much more significant body of youth who are in deadly earnest with their thought, and who find it essential to intellectual peace to at-

tain some sense of unity in their conception of the world. For this type of college youth — the most conscientious, most thoughtful, most precious — the blame for inconsistency between the new learning and the inherited faith lies, for the most part, not with the college, but with the Church. There was once a time when these young minds could be in some degree secluded by solicitous parents and anxious pastors from the signs of change in modern thought. They could be prohibited from approaching great tracts of literature; they could be hidden in the cloistered life of a strictly guarded college; their learning could be ensured to be in safe conformity with a predetermined creed. There is now no corner of the intellectual world where this seclusion is possible. Out of the most unexpected sources — a novel, a poem, a newspaper — issues the contagion of modern thought; and, in an instant, the life that has been shut in and has seemed secure is hopelessly affected.

And how does the young man, touched with the modern spirit, come to regard the faith which he is thus forced to reject? Sometimes he recalls it with a sense of pathos, as an early love soon lost; sometimes with a deep indignation, as the source of scepticism and denial.

For one educated youth who is alienated from religion by the persuasions of science, philosophy, or art, ten, we may be sure, are estranged by an irrational or impracticable teaching of religion. It is not an inherent issue between learning and faith which forces them out of the Church in which they were born; it is an unscientific and reactionary theory of faith. It is not the college which must renew its conformity to the Church; it is the Church which must open its eyes to the marvellous expansion of intellectual horizon which lies before the mind of every college student to-day.

There is another aspect of the same experience. This process of intellectual growth is often accompanied, not by a reaction from religion, but by a new appreciation of its reasonableness. In a degree which few who represent religion have as yet realized, the extension of the area of truth may be at the same time an expansion of spiritual vision and a revival of religious confidence. Within many a college, often without the knowledge of its religious teachers, the experience of intellectual liberty itself is renewing a rational faith. Many a student comes to college in a mood of complete antagonism to his earlier faith, but when that same youth four years later graduates from col-

lege, he may give himself with a passionate consecration to the calling of the Christian ministry which he had so lately thought superfluous and outgrown. It is the natural consequence of discovering that the religious life is not in conflict with the aims of a university, but is precisely that ideal of conduct and service toward which the spirit of a university logically leads. "I beseech you therefore, brethren," said the Apostle who knew most about the relation of scholarship to faith, "that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." That is a summons which the Christian Church still needs to hear. Two equal perils confront religion,— a service which is unreasonable, and a reason which is unserviceable; activity without thoughtfulness, and theology without vitality; sentiment without science, and truth without love. The religion of a college student must be a reasonable service, consistent with reverent truth-seeking, open to the light, hospitable to progress, rational, teachable, free. The Church which sets itself against the currents of rational thought, and has for great words like Evolution, Higher Criticism, Morality, Beauty, Law, only an undiscerning sneer, is in reality not a defender of the faith, but a poi-

tive ally of the infidelity of the present age. The Church which asks no loyalty that is not rational, no service of the will that is not an offering of the mind, comes with its refreshing message to many a bewildered young life and is met by dedication to a reasonable service.

So far, however, the religion of a college student has been described as it appears in every thoughtful age. There remains one aspect of the religious life which is peculiarly characteristic of a college student in this generation, and of which the Church in its relation to the young must take fresh account. Protestant teaching, from the time of Luther, has laid special emphasis on the Pauline distinction between faith and works. It is not man's performance, either of moral obligations or of ritual observances, which justifies him in the sight of God. He must offer that consecration of the heart, that conversion of the nature, which makes him find his life in God. This teaching was a necessary protest against the externalism and formalism which had been for centuries regarded by many as of the essence of the religious life. "We are justified by faith"; "The just shall live by faith" — these great words gave to religion its spiritual and personal significance as a religion between the individual soul and the living God.

But suppose that this touch of the life of God is felt by the soul of man, and that the soul desires to express its glad reaction — what is to be its channel of utterance? The history of Protestantism for the most part answers: "The organ of religious expression is the tongue. When the life is moved by the Holy Ghost, it is led to speak as the Spirit gives it utterance. It tells rejoicingly of its new birth; it confesses Christ before its fellows; it preaches to others the message which has brought it hope and peace." Here is the basis of organization in many Protestant churches — their meetings for free prayer; their conferences for religious revivals; their test of faith through spoken confession. It is a legitimate and inevitable way of self-expression. The life of the Spirit which descends from God to man leaps out of many lives into forms of speech as naturally as the water which descends from the hills leaps from its conduit into the air.

What the present age, however, is teaching us, as the world was never taught before, is that another and equally legitimate channel of expression is open to the life of faith. It is the language of works. We have come in these days to a time devoted in an unprecedented

degree to the spirit of philanthropy. It is the age of social service. No life can yield itself to the current of the time without being swept into this movement of passionate fraternity and social justice. But what is the attitude of the Christian Church to this modern phenomenon of social service? It is quite true that the Church is one of the most active agents of this philanthropic renaissance. The sense of social responsibility is manifested by the prodigious increase of parish charities, parish organizations, institutional churches, and Christian benevolence. Has the Church, however, appreciated the organic relationship which exists between faith and works and which the movement of social responsibility represents? To do for others has seemed to the tradition of the Church a superadded and secondary effect of religion, rather than one of its essential and original factors. First, one is to be religious; and then, as a consequence or ornament of his religion, he is to concern himself with the better ordering of the human world. A much deeper relation between faith and works is indicated by those solemn words in which Jesus sums up, as he says, the whole Law and the Prophets. There is, he teaches, a kinship of nature between the love of God and the love of man. The second

commandment is like the first. Both are parts of a complete religion. When a modern life, that is to say, is moved by the spirit of philanthropy, that impulse is not something from which the Church may stand apart and commend it as of another sphere. It is, in fact, one legitimate expression of the religious life; uttering itself not by the tongue, but by the hand, as though there had been heard the great word of the Apostle: "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

In other words, the Church has permitted the modern movement of philanthropy to proceed as though it were not an essential part of the Christian life, when in reality this whole vast enterprise is the way in which the modern world is actually uttering that faith in the possible redemption of mankind, to accomplish which the Church of Jesus Christ was expressly designed and inspired. A Christian minister was visiting one day a Women's Settlement, established in the most squalid region of a great city and purifying the neighborhood with its unassuming devotion; and looking about him said: "This is a very beautiful work, but I wish there were more of Christ in it." How could there be

more of Christ, one was moved to ask, than was already there? Would technical confession or oral expression add any significance to such a work in His eyes who said: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven"? Might not Jesus, if he should come again on earth, pass without notice many a splendid structure reared in his name, and, seeking out these servants of the broken-hearted and the bruised of the world, say to them: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me"? Why, then, is the Church not far-sighted enough to claim for itself what is justly its own? Why should it persist in restricting discipleship to a single way of expression, when in fact the spirit of God is so obviously manifesting itself at the present time by another way of expression? Is not the most immediate problem which confronts the Church to-day that of finding a place within its own religious teaching for this new manifestation of self-effacing philanthropy, and of claiming the age of social service as at heart an age of religious faith?

At precisely this point, where the spirit of

God is using as its modern language the service of man, the Christian Church meets the religion of the college student. The normal young man at the present time does not talk much about religion. Sometimes this reserve proceeds from self-consciousness and ought to be overcome, but quite as often it proceeds from modesty and ought to be respected. At any rate, such is the college student — a person disinclined to much profession of piety, and not easy to shape into the earlier type of an orally expressed discipleship. Yet, at the same time, this young man is extraordinarily responsive to the new call for human service. Never in the history of education were so many young men and young women in our colleges profoundly stirred by a sense of social responsibility and a passion for social justice. The first serious question which the college student asks is not, "Can I be saved? Do I believe?" but, "What can I do for others? What can I do for those less fortunate than I?" No one can live in a community of these young lives without perceiving a quality of self-sacrificing altruism so beautiful and so eager that it is akin to the emotions which in other days brought in a revival of religion.

What is the duty of the Church to a

mood like this? The duty — or rather the privilege of the Church — is to recognize that this is, in fact, a revival of religion; that in this generous movement of human sympathy there is a legitimate and acceptable witness of the life of God in the soul of the modern world. It may not be that form of evidence which other times have regarded as valid; it may, perhaps, not be the most direct way or the most adequate form of religious expression; but none the less it happens to be the way through which the Holy Spirit is at the present time directing the emotional life of youth to natural utterance. "I am not very religious," said one such youth one day, "but I should like to do a little to make of Harvard College something more than a winter watering-place." But was not that youth religious? Was it not the Spirit of God which was stirring his young heart? Was he not repeating the Apostolic confession: "Shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works"? What, indeed, is the final object of religion if it is not the making of that better world which this youth in his dream desired to see?

In this religion of a college student the teachers of religion must believe. They must take him as he is, and let him testify by conduct if

he will not testify by words. If the student can be assured that the religion which the Church represents is a practical, working, ministering faith; if he can see that the mission of the Church is not the saving of a few fortunate souls from a wrecked and drifting world, but the bringing of the world itself, like a still seaworthy vessel, with its whole cargo of hopes and fears, safe to its port; if he can believe that in the summons of the time to unselfish service he is in reality hearing the call of the living God; then he may come to regard the Church not, as he is often inclined to do, as an obstinate defender of impossible opinions, or a hothouse for exotic piety, or a cold-storage warehouse to preserve traditions which would perish in the open air; but as the natural expression of organized righteousness, the Body of those who are sanctified for others' sakes; and to such a Church he may offer his honest and practical loyalty.

Such are the tests to which religion must submit if it would meet the needs of a college student — the tests of reality, reasonableness, and practical service. A religion without reality — formal, external, technical, obscurantist; a religion without reasonableness — omniscient, dogmatic, timid; a religion which does not dis-

cern in the spirit of practical service a modern witness of the spirit of Christ — a religion thus organized and maintained may win the loyalty of emotional or theological or ecclesiastical minds, but it is not likely to be acceptable to the normal type of American youths. Their ardent and candid natures demand first a genuine, then a rational, and then a practical religion, and they are held to the Christian Church by no bond of sentiment or tradition which will prevent their seeking a more religious way of life. If they cannot find satisfaction for these demands in organized Christianity, then they will seek it elsewhere; in the cause of social revolution or in the cult of some new faith. At any cost they must emancipate themselves from formalism and traditionalism and find the Truth which makes men free.

What is this demand of healthy-minded youth but a challenge to the Church of Christ to renew its vitality at the sources of power? The intellectual issues of the present time are too critical to be evaded; the practical philanthropy of the present time is too persuasive to be subordinated or ignored. It is a time for the Church to forget its affectations and assumptions, and to give itself to the reality of rational religion and to the practical redemption of an

unsanctified world; and this return to simplicity and service will be at once a recognition of the religion of a college student and a renewal of the religion of Jesus Christ.

# IV

## THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE SOCIAL CONSCIENCE

THE most characteristic and significant discovery of the present generation — more epoch-making than the telephone or automobile or aeroplane,— is the discovery of the social conscience; — the recognition, in a degree unprecedented in history, of social responsibility; the demand, with an unprecedented imperativeness, for social justice; the substitution, on an unprecedented scale, of social morality for the creed of individualism. Never in human history were so many people, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, wise and otherwise, concerning themselves with social amelioration, dedicating themselves to philanthropy, organizing for industrial change, or applying the motives of religion to the problems of modern life. It is the age of the Social Question. A new phrase, the Social Organism, becomes the description of human society. A new significance is found in the great affirmation of St. Paul,

"We are members one of another." The single life has become uninterpretable except in its relation to the life of others. The economics of *laissez-faire* is displaced by the economics of combination; the ethics of self-culture is succeeded by the ethics of social service. The world, as a book which was among the first signs of the new spirit affirms in its title, "is the subject of redemption." "A single life," Professor Wallace has said, "may find salvation for itself, but it may be doubted whether such salvation is worth the trouble."

Here is a transition in human history which can be compared with nothing less than the transition from the astronomy of Ptolemy to the astronomy of Copernicus. Instead of a centre of interest fixed in the individual life, round which, like satellites, the problems of the social order revolve, the life of the individual is now seen to lie within a vastly greater system, to whose laws its orbit must conform, and as a part of which its duty must be fulfilled. How to adjust one's personal aims within the organism of the common good; how to realize one's self as a member of the social body; how to secure the stability of the social order by the co-operative consecration of individuals — that is the essence of the modern

Social Question, and it delivers one from the Ptolemaic ethics of self-centred morality and sets one in a Copernican universe of social unity and service. Here is not only a new social science, but a new social imperative; not merely a social consciousness, but a social conscience; a categorical summons to the person to fulfil his function within the social whole.

If, then, this sense of social responsibility marks so unmistakably the thought and conduct of the present age; if the problems most immediately pressing upon civilization are the social problems of the family, the State, the industrial order, and the Church; if we must thus think of people as living together, working together, and determining their duty within the organism of the common good; then it becomes of peculiar interest to observe how far this transition in thought has proceeded, and at what point in its evolution the social conscience has arrived. What form of reinforcement is for the moment most important in this world-wide movement of social service? What new demand does this development of social sensitiveness make upon the present age?

The answer to these questions appears to be plain. The age of the social question has brought with it a vast expansion of certain

sentiments which are among the most precious of human possessions, and which give to the present time a peculiar dignity and promise. Compassion, fraternity, generosity, loyalty, the passion for justice, the demand for conditions consistent with decency and self-respect — all these effects of the social conscience are operating with unprecedented force. Never was there such generous giving, such willing enlistment in philanthropy, such varied legislation for social reform. If the better world could come through expenditure of money or time, through legislation or organization, through prodigal charity or loyal trade-unionism or militant socialism, then the devotion and self-sacrifice dedicated to these ends would have their immediate reward. The heart of the time is soft; the conscience of the time is quick. The age of the social question summons each life, however weak or inefficient it may be, to find its appropriate place in the vast organism of social efficiency and service.

Yet while this expansion of social responsibility may be viewed with much satisfaction as a definite step in the moral education of the human race, the time has plainly come when the new movement of altruism is in special need of direction and control. It is like an electric

current of high power, which has in it extraordinary capacity for social utility, but at the same time carries extraordinary risk. The first problem of the engineer is to develope such a current, but his next and not less essential problem is to safeguard and govern it. An unregulated supply of power may not only bring disaster to the unwary passer-by, but may even wreck the mechanism designed for its transmission. It is a similar force of enthusiasm and responsibility which is now let loose in the modern world, and in any enterprise of social service one may count on a high-power current of generous emotion. Is this force, however, sufficiently insulated and safely distributed? Is social energy safeguarded by social wisdom? Is the social conscience of the time what the Apostle Paul described as a "good conscience," a sense of duty which can be trusted because it has been trained?

No thoughtful observer can fail to see that the social question of the present time has just reached the point where emotional power needs a new degree of intellectual direction and disciplined control. The administration of charity, for example, has passed beyond its sentimental period, and in the complex life of our great cities the call for sympathy is succeeded

by the call for expert knowledge. Sentimentalism in relief may easily propagate more poverty than it cures; scientific relief is confronted by the much more difficult problem of harnessing the forces of compassion within the mechanism of economic laws, so as to make sympathy effective and pity wise. Labor organization has had dramatic success in promoting loyalty and sacrifice, but now that it has become an economic force of high power, the time has arrived to determine whether its reckless use shall become a social menace, or its scientific insulation a social service. Employers, whether individuals or corporations, seem, with many splendid exceptions, to have been taken by surprise in the new industrial conflict, and they meet the strategy of a more highly organized antagonist, sometimes with precipitate surrender, sometimes with crude defences, and often with sheer bewilderment.

And what a portentous series of hasty experiments we are making with all manner of legislation concerning the family, the drink-traffic, child-labor, unemployment, universal pensions, and a hundred other propositions of the time! What is it that all these well-intended enterprises most immediately need? It is an accession of leadership, a supply of

experts, an equipment of sympathy with wisdom. Not less of heart is demanded to meet the increased complexity of social life, but more of head; not less sentiment, but more science; not less passion, but more patience. The social forces of the time have it in their power to wreck the very framework of American democracy, unless they be directed by disciplined minds. "The great problem of free organization," wrote John Stuart Mill, in a paper only lately made public, "is the art of choosing leaders, with superior wisdom, absence of egotism, truthfulness and moral sympathy." No more timely words could be spoken in the critical issues of industrial and political life which now confront American life. The modern social question cannot be fought through, or crowded through, or blundered through; it must be thought through. What was said by Marx of socialism is true of the social question, "The Reformation was the work of a monk; the revolution must be the work of a philosopher." Organization, machinery, legislation, social programmes, are essential to the progress of the social question; but the solution of that question waits for a supply of wisdom without egotism, and of truthfulness without cynicism.

There is a further aspect of the same demand. The social question needs not only a science, but a philosophy. It must not only be approached by the scientific habit of mind, but it must be interpreted as a movement of ethical idealism. On its face the present agitation is an economic question, concerned with conditions of tariffs and industries, food and drink, housing and rent, wages and hours, work and leisure; and many observers of the time have concluded that the key of the social question is to be found in some form of economic change. Shorten the hours of labor, they say, increase the wage, guarantee employment, insure against the risks of life, lift the level of earning farther from the margin of want, and the social question will be answered and social peace attained. The socialist propaganda gives to this view of progress the dignity of a philosophy. All social progress is described as dependent on economic change. The institutions, morality, and religion of any age are products of its economic conditions. "Tell me how you get what you eat, and I will tell you what you are." The consistent socialist, therefore, declines all entangling alliances with other forms of social amelioration, and devotes himself wholly to economic revolution, with the assurance that the

new industrial order will bring with it a new human nature to utilize and enjoy it.

This economic interpretation of history is, no doubt, encouraged by many facts, and it would be sheer sentimentalism to ignore the restorative effects of improved industrial conditions. But to see in the social question nothing more than a programme of economic revolution is to miss the very note which gives pathos and poignancy to the present agitation. The social question is not most clamorous where economic conditions are at their worst, and unheard where wages are highest, but on the contrary becomes most critical in those countries where production is most abundant and the conditions of the wage-earners most hopeful. The social question, in other words, is not a sign of economic decadence, but of economic progress. It meets people, not on their way down, but on their way up. It comes not of having less, but of wanting more. It accompanies, not decrease of possessions, but increase of desires. Though it utter itself in the language of economic science, its origin and motives lie much deeper in human life than the demand for a redistribution of wealth.

What is this new note which is heard in the social movement, and which compels the atten-

tion of the present age? It is the note of social obligation; the demand for justice, opportunity, the humanization of life. Very harsh and discordant are many of the voices which utter this cry of the time, but it is precisely in detecting beneath the bitterness, unreasonableness and incoherence of the social protest this underlying tone of moral passion and desire that the capacity to meet the issue is to be found. In short, the social question is at bottom an ethical question, whose interior nature must be interpreted in terms of morals, and whose appeal is finally made to the social conscience.

At this point, then, the science of the social question passes into its philosophy. It is not only true that the need of the time is for more competent leadership, but it is also true that this leadership must be equipped with an ethical idealism, and trained in the faith that such ethical idealism is the key alike of a sound philosophy and of a stable social world. The next step in social progress must be taken by men who shall combine the scientific habit of mind with the idealist's direction of the will. Social schemes must be made the servants of the social conscience. Social wisdom must rest on social philosophy. "Where there is no vision, the

people perish." The river of healing for the social evils of the time flows from those high places where the streams of science and idealism meet.

Where, then, are we to look for this new appreciation of social ethics which shall give direction to the social conscience? Many sources of social sanity must be recognized and utilized, but it becomes evident that the new demand provides a new opportunity for the higher education. A university, if it is to fulfil in any degree its function, is likely to influence in two ways the plastic life of youth. In the first place, it should train the scientific spirit into a ruling habit of the intellectual life. It should detach the growing mind from the entangling interests of practical affairs, and permit a view of things which has perspective, horizon, equanimity and grasp. Matthew Arnold said of Sophocles that he saw things steadily and saw them whole. That is the best lesson which can be learned from an academic teacher — the capacity to look on the facts of life, not excitedly and passionately, but sanely and steadily, and to see them, not as fragments, but as parts of a comprehensive whole. It is sometimes said that academic people are theorists, and that what is needed to-day is practical men. But what is it to theorize, and what

is the relation of theory to practice? Theory, in its Greek signification, is the capacity for vision; the seeing things as they are; the survey of truth with a large horizon. And what is there so much needed in a practical age as this kind of theorist? Doers we have in plenty; but where are our seers? Action is eager enough; but where is vision? Views there are in abundance; but where are the leaders who have a view of life, its motives and aims, its incidents and enterprises, seen from the height of scientific detachment and judicious temper? These are the products of a liberal education, a training which liberates from the transient and incidental and finds the Truth which makes men free.

In the second place, the centres of the higher learning share with the institutions of religious worship the supreme function of representing in national life a faith in ethical idealism. Education, it must be admitted, has been much modified by the practical demands of the modern world; but it still remains true that our colleges and universities provide a natural atmosphere for the idealist's vision and hope. "A university," as President Gilman once said, "is a home of idealism; if it were not that, it would be better that its walls should crumble in a night." In a

worthy place of learning these two factors of faith in the Eternal meet in the making of a scholar's mind. On the one hand, the great masters of thought, the great ideas of the reason, the universal laws of science, the perennial persuasions of art, invite the mind beyond the fragmentary and temporary to see things steadily and see them whole; and on the other, there looks up to these heights of the ideal the unspoiled life of youth, not yet bent down by the tasks of life, but erect and responsive, with the "rays of dawn on their white shields of expectation." These are our natural idealists. The vision splendid has not yet faded into the light of common day. The character of youth has not yet been hardened by the rub of life, or subdued to that it works in, like the dyer's hand. Young people, among the influences of academic life, have their own faults; they are often careless, reckless and self-confident; but they have not yet been smitten with the maladies of the worldly-wise, with hopelessness, loss of vision, the atrophy of sensibility or the scorn of idealism. The spirit of youth looks upon the world as fluid and malleable, like a stream of molten metal flowing to the mould which the artist has designed. A liberal education has failed of its main intention if it does not prolong and justify

the natural idealism of healthy-minded youth.

At this point, then, the universities and the social conscience meet. By one of the most interesting transitions in the history of education the academic life has made a new connection with the modern world. Instead of being sidetracked in scholasticism and dilettantism, the higher education in science and in philosophy has been developed into a trunk-line, which leads from learning to life. A new series of studies has been incorporated in the curriculum of the universities. Where, a generation ago, scarcely a single academic course, offered in any country, approached the social question as a problem of philosophy, to-day, in Germany, France, Great Britain and the United States, no university regards its system of instruction as complete without proposing to apply the principles of ethics to the questions of the social order, and enlisting trained recruits for the army of social service. No group of studies proves more inviting to the students than those which thus analyze and interpret the problems of modern society. A new department of research opens a window from college studies to the working world, and looks out upon a new horizon of duty. Education is touched, in an unprecedented degree, by the spirit of social morality. Students in large and

increasing numbers voluntarily associate themselves in various forms of social service, and throw themselves into these undertakings of philanthropy with athletic zest. A new profession is in process of creation, and it has as yet the peculiar advantage of being one of the few vocations now inviting educated men and women where the demand still outruns the supply.

This response of the universities to the call of the social conscience has already had perceptible effects in the social struggle itself. The finest expression, for example, of modern philanthropy — that self-effacing neighborliness which we call the Settlement System — was devised by a university tutor, established by university students, and for years bore the title of the University Settlement plan. Industrial reform feels the same effect of academic idealism. The employing class have been, for the most part, reluctantly driven to social amelioration, and the more important steps have been taken by an unexpected combination of wage-earners and idealists. The labor movement in Great Britain is little else than the idealism of Carlyle and Ruskin translated into the language of working-class organization and protest; and what the working-class movement at the present time

most definitely needs in all lands is more knowledge and saner leadership. How to know enough to be of real use; how to see enough to be a real leader; how to be good enough to be good for something — that is the new problem of social service, which gives to academic training its new importance in the moral education of the human race.

Nor can one stop even here in this estimate of education in its relation to the social conscience. It is not only true that the appeal of the social conscience is expanding and moralizing the sphere of the academic life, but it is still further true that there may be discerned within the universities, emerging from this new moral enthusiasm, that Religion of a College Student which has already been described. What is this call of the time to educated youth which summons them to social service? What are these motives of self-effacing usefulness, this dissatisfaction with the self-centred life, this summons to find life in losing it, if they are not a reiteration of the appeal which in all the ages of faith have turned men from self-seeking to self-sacrifice, and revealed the life of God touching the souls of men?

There are many channels through which hu-

man experience is led toward this co-operation with the Divine purpose and made a laborer together with God. Sometimes this fulfilment of life is reached through the conclusions of the reason, sometimes through the exaltation of the emotions; but it is not impossible that the present age is in an unprecedented and often unrecognized way drawing young lives toward the Eternal through the dedication of the will to human service. The new humanism may utter itself in language unfamiliar to the traditions of religion; it may speak to many religious people in an unknown tongue; but if it be, in its interior nature, a spiritual movement, then it may also be the first premonition of a renaissance of religious responsibility and consecration. A great movement of social morality is not likely to fulfil itself without expanding into a new type of religious life. The social movement, followed to its highest expression, leads one up to religion; and religion, made generous and self-forgetting, leads one down to service. The socialization of religion meets the spiritualization of the social conscience. The discovery of the social conscience may open a way to the still more epoch-making discovery of a more adequate, stable and socialized religious faith. The call of the Social Question, which the young

men and women of the present generation so distinctly hear and so gladly obey, may prove in the end to be, not only a summons to the service of man, but not less audibly a call from God.

# V

## THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

It is only a small minority of American youths who may approach the problems of citizenship by way of the college or the university. All, however, by one way or another, through the sheltered path of the higher education or along the rougher road of work and wage-earning, enter in early manhood into that eager and tumultuous life which has given to the civilization of the United States its peculiar characteristics both of promise and of peril. The young man becomes a citizen. He marries, and in greater or less degree of comfort and stability makes for himself a home; he throws himself into his career; he takes his share in the political life of his town, his State, his nation. In this environment of a community and a country his own soul must live, if live it can. Here are the inevitable conditions of his religious life. How, then, shall he adjust himself to them? What has he to anticipate for his own spiritual nature in this larger world? What may this

new transition in experience involve? What is to be the religious education of an American citizen?

In approaching this question one must again begin with definitions. Religious education, as has already been pointed out, is not attained by accepting a theological system, or concurring in an ancient creed, or learning by rote a prescribed catechism, however desirable or essential these acquisitions may be. Religious education means, as the words imply, the drawing out of the religious nature, the clarifying and strengthening of religious ideals, the enriching and rationalizing of the sense of God. Religious education is, therefore, not to be imposed from without, but to be developed from within. It assumes the susceptibility and responsiveness of human life to the approaches of the Divine life, and by every influence of suggestion and environment clears the way by which the love of God may reach the soul of man. Education thus becomes, as Lessing announced it to be, revelation; — the disclosure to the will of man of the will of God.

Nor is this the whole of religious education. A life which has thus acquired a quickened and active sense of Divine control becomes inevitably associated with God's purpose for the

world, so far as that may be revealed. Revelation thus passes over into dedication. The end of education is service. The consciousness of God directs one's will to the establishing of the Kingdom of God. The life that is sanctified becomes sanctified for others' sakes. The daily prayer of a religiously educated life is not only: "Thy will be done," but not less: "Thy kingdom come."

And if this is religious education what, on the other hand, is an American citizen? He is not merely one who has acquired the right to vote, or has a stake in the property of the nation, or has been rescued from a condition of hyphenization. He is one who with the privileges has accepted the obligations of American citizenship. He has found in the conditions and opportunities of American democracy that sphere of personal and social action which is to him most welcome and congenial. An American citizen does not wish he were born under a monarchical or aristocratic or feudal system; he does not view the experimental imperfections of Democracy with condescension or contempt; he prefers a civilization in the making to a civilization which is ready-made, the risks of a rushing stream to the risks of a stagnant pool. Faith in democracy is the atmosphere in which he has been born and

bred; or for the sake of that faith he has ventured across the sea. In the vast and seething melting-pot of American civilization there is fulfilling itself, he believes, a mighty process through which the gold of national character is to be precipitated and the heterogeneous elements of American life are to be purified as by fire.

If then he is to receive a religious education, it must be wrought out of these conditions of American citizenship. There must be no conflict of authority, no ecclesiastical law overriding or obstructing national law. Religion is not to be reserved for days of worship only, or occasions of special need, or citizenship to be habitually conducted as if there were no God of righteousness or love. Life must be integral and harmonious. The institutions of American citizenship, just as they are, with all their imperfections and blunders, must be the instruments of a religious life. If the Kingdom of God is to come in America it must come through the agencies of citizenship. To contribute to their stability and develope their possibilities is not only to be a loyal citizen, but at the same time to get a practical education in religion. Patriotism and personality must thrive together. The freedom of citizenship

must be a part of that religious loyalty whose service is perfect freedom.

But is this unity of experience attainable? Can there be any such identity of motives in citizenship and religion? Are not the principles and practices of American life hopelessly removed from the ideal of a Kingdom of God? Is not family life in the United States disintegrated and declining; are not business dealings degraded by brutality and fraud; is not political action tainted by self-interest and partisanship; are not international negotiations corrupted by tortuous diplomacy and broken pledges? What chance is there in such a soil for the growth and flowering of a religious life? How can one meet the problems of an American home, or make his living by the methods of American business, or tolerate the scheming of American politics, or see his country entering into the mighty rivalries of the World-Powers, without frankly recognizing that the service of God has been abandoned for the service of Mammon, and the Kingdom of God supplanted by the kingdoms of this world? Must not a choice be made between religious education and American citizenship? If one would lead a consistently religious life must he not separate himself from the normal conduct of the modern world as the

saints of the Middle Ages fled from the corruption of their time to the spiritual security of monastic cells? Has not the tragic history of three years of war demonstrated that the way to security and success, for either a citizen or a nation, leads to an end where the ideals of equity and mercy are no longer within the horizon of practical affairs, and where from dreams of a Utopia of faith and prayer one is rudely waked into a Godless world?

It must be candidly admitted that many signs of the present time go far to justify this scepticism. The colossal tragedy which is overwhelming Europe, and the hardly less demoralizing consequences of commercial inflation and moral neutrality in this country, have put an unprecedented strain on the faith of the idealist, and have encouraged the prophets of a degenerate and materialized world. The institution of the family, we are told, has become little more than the survival of a pleasant and primitive fiction. The business world has become a scene of war, where great alliances of wage-earners attack the central powers of capital in their trenches of privilege; and as for political life, whether local, national, or international, there is, it is said, no law but force, no strength but in numbers, no peace but through power, and

no permanent escape from the present hell of war. It is a good time, therefore, to examine once more these pillars of our civilization, and to consider whether they are thus tottering in decay.

It is obvious that the easy optimism which satisfied many minds before the cyclone of war swept down upon the world is no longer a practicable philosophy. The cheerful song of Pippa, "God's in His heaven, all's right with the world," no longer strikes the prevailing note of so stern and distracting a time. But is it true that the terrific events which have laid this easy faith in ruins have swept away with it the whole structure of idealism, as though the cyclone were a deluge from which no dry land was ever to emerge? Is it certain that the pillars of a good world are crumbling? Must civilization be reconstructed on a new and untried plan? Has American citizenship parted company forever from religious education; and has the world lost not only millions of precious lives, but also its still more precious soul?

On the contrary, even if one looks at things just as they are and accepts without evasion the solemn challenge of the time, there meet him, in the very institutions of citizenship which appear to be so gravely threatened, the condi-

tions of rational faith and the instruments of national character. It is not that the material of a religious education has been destroyed, but that it has in large degree been undiscovered. It is not that the pillars of our social order are rotten, but that they have not been tested. It is not, Mr. Chesterton has said, that Christianity has been tried and found wanting; it is that it has been found difficult and never tried. It is not, as many believe, that in a time like this there is nothing left of religion, but on the contrary, that in a time like this there is nothing but religion left.

Let us recall once more the social institutions which create the environment of American citizenship, and observe their nature and effect. Each when closely examined exhibits a twofold character, and the anxious or sceptical critic may be easily confused or misled. Each has its external defects and disasters, but each in its interior character is a witness of the motives of idealism and depends on these motives for stability and permanence.

The institution of the family, for example, is, it is true, threatened by light-mindedness and lust. One marriage in twelve in the United States is, we are told, shattered by divorce. Yet, on the other hand, nothing

is more obvious than the ethical significance and the unparalleled effect on citizenship of the normal type of family life in the United States. If it be true that one union in twelve is broken, it is not less true that eleven out of twelve survive. If it be true that the family is often corrupted by commercialism and self-interest, it is not less true that it is much oftener perpetuated by unconstrained and self-effacing love. An epidemic of social disease should not obscure the more prevalent condition of general social health. All competent observers, whether from Europe or from the Orient, agree in the conclusion that the domestic type evolved from the conditions of American civilization is a unique contribution to the moral education of the race, and that a free Democracy finds its original and clearest expression in the free union of partners through mutual affection and restraint. In this fertile soil of the American family the religious education of a citizen begins. In this relationship, first as child, then as husband or wife, and then as parent, the great majority of American citizens receive their first lessons in altruism and learn to sanctify themselves for others' sakes.

The immediate problem of the family in American life is therefore not one of criticism or apology or the devising of ways to escape from

so antiquated a compulsion, but on the contrary, the problem of the utilization, simplification and safe-guarding of that union. The vitality of religion in the mature experience of citizens who must accept the stress and haste of American life is primarily dependent on the reality of that religion which they have acquired under the conditions of an uncorrupted, simple, and happy home. The Kingdom of God which is the end of religious education is nothing else than the realization of that social ideal whose germinal type is the normal family. "Except ye turn," said Jesus, "and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of God." It was a summons from the complexity and confusion of the world to the instincts and impulses which are naturally learned at a mother's knee; and this recall to the original sources of religious education the American citizen must turn to hear.

When one passes from the religious education provided by the home to the circumstances of industrial and commercial life in the United States at the present time, he is met by a still more convinced and passionate scepticism. Modern business, we are told, is nothing else than organized piracy. "There is no such thing," it is said, "as an ethical bargain.

There are no honest goods to buy or sell. . . . The hideous competitive war makes the industrial order seem like the triumph of hell and madness on earth." "The business man who is not willing to be a wolf cannot remain in his business." Many signs of the business world unquestionably confirm this counsel of despair. The war between the rival forces of industry is often cruel and merciless, and lust of gain on the one side is matched by reckless hate on the other. It is as hard as it was in the time of Jesus Christ for those who trust in riches to enter into the Kingdom of God. The habit of acquisition easily becomes an insidious disease, and the hand which has become prehensile in its grasp grows paralyzed when it would open its palm. A time of inflated prosperity and unbridled extravagance is called to hear once more the word of Jesus: "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

Must we, however, conclude that this great area of human conduct, in which the vast majority of American citizens necessarily pass most of their waking hours, provides no field for a religious education? On the contrary, the essential nature of business life is not, as is so freely affirmed, irretrievably base and sordid, but disciplinary, educative, and creative. In the form

of productive effort, through agriculture, manufacture and the mechanic arts, business life is a vast organization of social service, existing to provide others with what they want; and in the form of finance or the exchange of values, business life is a still more elaborate organization of credit, existing through mutual integrity and good faith. It is sometimes fancied that a man is best equipped for business success by audacity, unscrupulousness and cunning. The truth is, however, that for one man who profits by luck or fraud a thousand owe all they have gained to integrity and uncorruptibility. The profits of honorable persistency are on the whole vastly greater than the profits of recklessness or fraud. Business life, in other words, just as it is, with all its solicitations to unscrupulousness, offers at least a fair chance for the religious education of an American citizen. Its temptations set one, it is true, as on a high mountain where the kingdoms of this world lie at one's feet, and the promise is heard: "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me"; but it is as possible in America as it was in Palestine to answer: "Get thee hence, Satan!" and to turn from the passion for the kingdoms of this world to the much more persuasive passion for the Kingdom of God.

As one looks, then, at the opportunities of modern business now offered to sagacious and far-sighted Americans, the first impression which is made by the prevailing habit of mind in many men of business is not so much of its cupidity as of its stupidity. They are so preoccupied with the chances of immediate profit or with the temporary contentions of commercial life that they do not see the new world of industrial opportunity which is even now knocking at their doors. They have not discovered that the labor question has been converted into a human question; that they must in future deal not merely with mechanical processes but with the passions and desires of human beings; and that if they do not want contention, bitterness and revolt, they must provide equity, fraternity and the right to a human life. "A trade," it has been wisely said, "is that which a man follows in order to live; and a profession is that to follow which a man lives."[1] The problem of modern industrial life, in other words, is the lifting of trades into professions, the humanizing of handiwork, the conversion of tasks to which workers are called into "vocations" which call to the workers.

[1] Henry Jones, *Idealism as a Practical Creed*, Glasgow, 1909, p. 118.

Here is where business sagacity — not to say business sanity — now begins. It organizes schemes of industrial co-operation, conciliation, or partnership, not merely to escape the wastage of industrial war, but to unite the forces of production and distribution as a league to enforce industrial peace, not as a device of patronage but as an expression of fraternalism and justice. Business stability in the future of American life is to be dependent in an unprecedented degree on a fresh accession of social responsibility and co-operative conscientiousness, and the man of business who commits himself to sound experimentation in this field of industrial fraternalism will find in his business career itself the material and the motives of a religious education.

When one passes finally from the problems of home and of business to the political conditions of this amazing and bewildering time, he is met by a still more tragic sense of maladjustment and confusion. In the wranglings of partisanship and the horrors of war, what is left, one asks himself, of the ideals of religion and the vision of a Kingdom of God? Has not government become a mere struggle for spoils and diplomacy a mere game of gamblers? Have not the masses of citizens become mere pawns in a great game? Are not small principalities

transferred from one great Power to another, as Lord John Russell once said, like firkins of butter passed from hand to hand? How can one talk of education in religion when the world is being educated in the art of slaughter, or lift up his thoughts to a heaven of peace when he is thrust down into a hell of war?

And yet, through the thick darkness of the present time, with its uninterpretable mysteries and its irremediable losses, one ray of light already reaches the stricken world and illuminates the tragic scene. Whatever else is still hidden in the shadows of an unexplored future, this at least has already become plain — that through the suffering and sorrow of the time, and its daily summons to face the supreme demands of life and death, there is occurring in all nations a vast process of religious education; and that the sense of man's dependence and God's guidance is in a totally unprecedented degree becoming real and efficient in millions of lives. On this point the testimony both from the men in the trenches and from their trembling friends at home is beyond dispute. Much as has been lost, God, in a multitude of instances, has been found. Men who have been, as they themselves believed, irretrievably enslaved by levity or self-indulgence,

are finding themselves sobered, chastened, emancipated, and redeemed. Impulses and desires which they had thought outgrown with the clothes and sports of childhood, now reassert themselves with a new authority, and the ideals of loyalty, sacrifice, contrition and devotion to the will of God have become clarified and compelling. These lives have been saved, "yet so as by fire and the fire is trying every man's work, of what sort it is."

Such a baptism by fire is not likely to be soon forgotten. Many aspects of religion, which have hitherto seemed important, will, we may anticipate, no longer command from these lives even a lingering interest. The conflicts of sects, the claims of sacerdotalism, the elaboration of creeds, and the æstheticism of worship, which have so often preoccupied the minds of theologians and ecclesiastics, will seem remote and unreal to men who have crouched in the trenches facing eternity and meditating on death. It may even happen, as has been suggested, that many people will have to leave the Church in order to be Christians. Yet of the reality of religion itself, the communion of the soul with God, the renewal of faith through one supreme act of self-effacing loyalty,— of all this there will be a new assurance, and those who

have found in their terrific experiences a courage, patience, and peace of mind unknown to them in peaceful days, may return from the front — if they return at all — as missionaries return from the terrors of the jungle to teach their stay-at-home and unawakened brethren the elementary principles of a rational religious life.

An English author, whose extraordinary gifts have often been tainted by sensualism and cynicism, has testified to this discovery of God through the solemn experience of these illuminating years. "I believe," writes Mr. H. G. Wells, "that only through a complete simplification of religion to its fundamental idea, to a world-wide realization of God as the King of the heart and of all mankind, . . . can mankind come to any certain security and happiness. . . . I conceive myself to be thinking as the world thinks, and if I find no great facts, I find a hundred little indications to reassure me that God comes. Even those who have neither the imagination nor the faith to apprehend God as a reality will, I think, realize presently that the Kingdom of God over a world-wide system of republican States is the only possible formula under which we may hope to unify and save mankind." [1] What is this extraordinary confession

[1] *Italy, France and Britain at war*, Macmillan, 1917, p. 284.

of a mind completely alienated from organized Christianity but a testimony to religious education, a cleansing of motives and a vision of service, which — as they are realized in millions of lives — may in the end make these years of tragedy — if not wholly interpretable or atoned for — at least an epoch of spiritual revival and rational faith?

And if this is what can happen through the blood-stained ministry of war, may it not conceivably happen through a more complete understanding of the nature and problems of a world at peace? Must we wait to stand in the immediate presence of death before we can learn how to live? Is physical carnage the only way to spiritual courage? Is God to be found nowhere but in the trenches? Or is it possible that the religious education which has been wrought out of the disasters of war may be perpetuated and reinforced among the not less difficult problems of the world that is to be? Shall we not emerge from this eclipse of idealism into a saner, simpler, and more convincing type of religion? Must the lessons of soldierliness be learned in an era of destruction alone, or may one amid the more subtle perils of a reconstructed world become a good soldier of Jesus Christ? That is the solemn question which

confronts modern civilization as it begins to grope its way through the present horror to the problems that lie beyond the war. "A complete simplification of religion," "an assurance that God comes," "a Kingdom of God over a world-wide system of Republican States,"— this "formula," by which "we may hope to unify and save mankind" is not for armies and navies alone to teach, but for consecrated citizenship to verify by experience. This is what religion is to mean in the world that is at our doors; and in contributing to this universal end must be fulfilled the religious education of each American citizen.

# VI

## THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

THE American citizen, whether he be college-bred or not, finds himself in early manhood thrown into a world of extraordinary opportunities, advantages, temptations and risks. In some aspects the history of the United States repeats the experience of other types of civilization, but in other and fundamental traits it is a story without precedent, both in its external forms and in its effects on national character. The first impression which this social history is likely to create in an observer's mind is that of a population singularly devoted to commercial aims. "Beyond striving for gold," a foreign critic has lately remarked, "the Americans have no ideal. They think everything can be achieved by gold. Their megalomania makes a grotesque impression."

It is not surprising that this is the effect which a hasty survey of American life may produce. No economic phenomenon of the

modern world is so vast in dimensions or so conspicuous in effects as the growth in wealth exhibited during the last fifty years by the United States. It has become the richest nation in the world, and the volume of prosperity increases with amazing and accelerated rapidity. Commercial life is, therefore, the immediate environment in which the American citizen must meet the problems of his own life. He applies himself with eager expectancy to get his full share of the abundance which nature and skill have placed within his reach. Most of his waking hours are devoted to the making of a living. The great majority of the American people are primarily concerned with industrial production or affairs of trade. Professional independence, artistic detachment, or contemplative seclusion, is much less practicable in the swift and fluid movement of American civilization than in the immobility of European or Oriental life. The making of money or the spending of it, or the advising about money-matters, make the most conspicuous occupations of American citizens, and for the sake of these commercial opportunities great multitudes of sanguine money-seekers have crossed the sea.

In spite of the invasion of trade by the English nobility, the European tradition has on the

whole regarded commercial life as below the level of a self-respecting aristocracy, and in ancient Japan even artisans and farmers held a higher place in the social hierarchy than merchants or bankers. In the United States, on the other hand, an unsubdued and unexplored continent has summoned both enterprise and genius to commercial life, and the vocations of manufacture, transportation, and production have come to possess at least equal standing with professional careers. With this marvellous expansion of industry the demand for competent direction has become even more imperative, and the administration of commercial affairs claims the highest talent. Schools of training for business rank with other graduate schools at the universities, and the most tempting prizes, not only of income but of national distinction, are won by the leaders in trade or finance. If, then, there is to be developed a national character which is indigenous and typical, it must be wrought out of these conditions of economic progress. In a degree unprecedented in history the United States is a commercial democracy.

Nor is there anything essentially discreditable in these commercial aims. Few persons are, on the whole, more respectably engaged than when

they are busy in securing by honest labor for themselves and for those whom they love the means of self-support and comfort. What is it, then, in this vast economic development which may prove disastrous to the American character? It is the confusion of the spirit of industrialism with the spirit of commercialism. Industrialism is creative, constructive, educative. It is engaged in making things which other people want, or in bringing things where other people want them. It is the organization of production and distribution. Commercialism, on the other hand, is a habit of mind, a social creed, a trader's point of view, which estimates all values by the money-standard and hopes to obtain by money things which money cannot buy. Good and evil, success and failure, are to the spirit of commercialism not ethical, but monetary terms.

The spirit of commercialism, for example, speaks of a "good marriage" when there may be in the contract nothing good except money. The spirit of commercialism calls a man "successful" though the skeleton of moral bankruptcy may be hidden in the closet of industrial success. The spirit of commercialism describes a man as "worth a million" when he may be in fact worth nothing or much less than

nothing. The spirit of commercialism, in other words, translates such words as possession, success, or worth, from an ethical to a financial vocabulary. "At the cross of the transepts of Milan Cathedral," Ruskin writes, "has lain for three hundred years the embalmed body of Saint Carlo Borromeo. It holds a golden crozier and has a cross of emeralds on his breast. Admitting the crozier and emeralds as useful articles, is the body to be considered as having them? Do they in the politico-economical sense of property belong to it? If not, and if we may therefore conclude generally that a dead body cannot possess property, what degree and period of animation in the body will render possession possible? As thus, lately, in the wreck of a California ship, one of the passengers fastened a belt about him with two hundred pounds of gold in it, with which he was found afterward at the bottom. Now, as he was sinking, had he the gold, or had the gold him?" [1] This is precisely the problem which confronts an industrial democracy. What degree of animation must one have in himself to possess in fact the property which is apparently his own? As he is sinking from the ship of industrialism into the sea of commercial-

[1] *Unto This Last,* Essay IV. *Ad valorem.*

ism, shall we say that he has his gold, or that his gold has him?

Here, then, is the fallacy which threatens industrial America — the illusion of wealth, the perversion of happiness, the deceptiveness of possession. Yet the American character is but half defined when it is thus identified with a sordid and vulgar commercialism. By one of the most dramatic coincidences in human history the same nation which has become thus committed to commercial enterprise is at the same time the heir of a great tradition of moral and religious idealism. The early settlers of the Western continent were not freebooters or buccaneers, tempted across the sea by the lust of gold, but sober and God-fearing exiles, seeking freedom to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences. No historical event was ever more free from the spirit of commercialism than the founding of New England. "We are called to enter," said Governor Winthrop, "into a covenant with God for this work. We have taken up a commission. . . . For this work we must be knit together as one man; we must uphold a familiar converse together in all meekness, gentleness, patience and liberty. So shall we keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. We shall find that the God of Israel is among us, so

that men shall say of succeeding plantations, 'The Lord make it like to that of New England.'" It was much the same with what Winthrop called "succeeding plantations." German Pietists ventured into the defiles of the Alleghenies, believing that the weakness of God was stronger than the arrows of Indians. English Quakers named their commonwealth after William Penn and their settlement the "City of Brotherly Love." Peace-loving Moravians reared at Bethlehem and Salem new "Hills of the Lord," like their sacred Herrnhut in Eastern Prussia. Huguenot refugees found asylum in the colony at Charleston. "These all," as the Apostle said of his own ancestors, "being destitute, afflicted, tormented . . . obtained a good report through faith." They were not commercialists but idealists. They desired not a richer country, but a better one. They sojourned, as Paul said of Abraham, "in a strange country," looking for a city whose foundations were not in trade but in God.

Spiritual inheritances like these may be obscured from time to time by the bulk of prosperity which has been superimposed on these foundations, or may be ignored among the more complex conditions of trade and wealth. It may even become the fashion for descend-

ants of the Puritans to look back with condescension or contempt on the rigors of the earlier conscience and the hardness of a primitive faith. Yet whenever it happens that the American character is put to the test of magnanimity, generosity, sacrifice, compassion, or religious faith, these spiritual inheritances reassert themselves like a hereditary strain in the nation's blood, and inspire action as with a call from the ancestral past. Deeper than the habits of a commercialized generation is this susceptibility to the motives of idealism. The same people who are so keen in trade and so gifted with initiative and foresight in money-making, have offered to the modern world its most impressive evidences of a national character dominated by spiritual aims. "A race of men," a discerning observer of American life has said, "carrying on commerce merely in order to live, feeling no idealism impelling them to industry, would never have produced such tangible results or gained such power. . . . Moral earnestness has not been a mere episode in the life of America." [1]

The single instance of organized religion sustained by voluntary offerings is a sufficient illustration of this truth. Instead of the State

[1] Münsterberg, *The Americans*, pp. 254, 356.



12991

Churches of Europe, maintained from public funds, ruled by bishops who may be designated by prime ministers, and by clergy who are officials of government, the administration of religion in the United States represents in an unprecedented degree the persistent idealism of a free nation. Without State subsidy, except by that benevolent neutrality which exempts from taxation, and under the fixed principle of separation between Church and State, more than two hundred thousand places of worship, valued at more than a billion dollars, are maintained by the voluntary generosity of their adherents and the dedication of commercial gains to ideal ends. Still more dramatic — and to many minds Utopian — is the expansion of the same sense of responsibility until it comprehends the religious needs of the entire world. The vast enterprise of Foreign Missions, in which all Western nations have their part, has had its most unstinted recognition in the United States, and every less favored land is now dotted with institutions of worship, education and relief, where thousands of heroic souls are maintained in their great crusade of love and mercy by the voluntary benevolence of millions of Americans.

The organization of philanthropy in the United States is another impressive witness of

the American character. State aid for dependents and defectives has its most conspicuous illustrations in other lands, but for voluntary methods of relief applied to all types of need nothing can be compared with the lavishness, not to say the prodigality, of American benevolence. Vast sums of money — the profits of commercialism — are dedicated to equally vast enterprises for the care of the destitute and the prevention of disease; and in less conspicuous though often more self-sacrificing ways multitudes of Americans feel the compulsion of conscience to offer not their money only, but themselves, for the service of the less fortunate.

The same testimony is given by the earlier history of the higher education in the United States. State universities have, it is true, become recognized as legitimate objects for expenditure through taxation, but the earlier group of universities and colleges, established by private means and sustained by personal loyalty, still commands generous support and perpetuates the national tradition of large and free benevolence. Here, then, is a national character of a more complex type than that of a completely commercialized democracy; a people so richly endowed with quickness of conscience, re-

sponsiveness to need, a large view of social duty, and a personal loyalty to God — that, even if they have outgrown the severity and simplicity of earlier faiths, they still testify to the survival of traits which marked those original "Plantations."

The same inherent inclination to idealism is still exhibited in many of the latest transactions and propositions which reveal the heart of the American people, and which surprise or confound those who fancy the national character to be simply and crudely commercial. "The Open Door," secured by American diplomacy to China, has led to an international friendship which makes America the trusted adviser of a new and vast republic. Disinterested candor in dealing with Japan has won that proud nation to a confidence which even the hysterical animosity of legislators has not yet been able to destroy. Even the politicians of the United States have come to realize that a candidate who would win popular applause must be — or at least pretend to be — a moral idealist, promoting a cause which the conscience of the people should support. "The square deal," the "appeal to the people," the protest against "privilege," or "the money power," or "Wall Street," or the "crucifying of the nation on a cross of gold," — all these

campaign cries of American politics, whether shouted by honest reformers or by clever demagogues, assume that the masses of plain Americans are peculiarly susceptible to moral exhortation, and that a cause, even if it be no better than personal ambition or sectional animosity, must be urged in the language of disinterestedness and commended to the conscience of the people.

Such, then, is the American character — not dominated by a single motive, but the battle-ground where two motives contend. In the struggle for mastery between these two opposing impulses the fundamental problem of security and permanence for the American Republic is revealed. "Ill fares the land," said Goldsmith, "to hastening ills a prey, where wealth accumulates and men decay." If national prosperity and the resulting passion for gain must involve the decline of those ideal motives which have dignified an honorable past, then the United States of America will have its day of extravagant splendor and will then repeat the history of other decadent civilizations and crumble at the touch of less degenerate, even if more barbaric, foes; but if the uncommercialized aims which still survive shall become more imperative and shall call the soul of the nation to new generosities and self-sacrifices commensurate with its

vast capacities, then the great days of the American democracy are still to come.

In this critical situation, whose issue, it must be confessed, is not absolutely determined, there are at least two considerations which may reassure one's hope. The first is derived from the sheer magnitude of the problems which now confront the American democracy. The resources of nature, the conquest of a continent, the development of transportation, diversified production, and mechanical invention — all these and many other causes have compelled an extension of intellectual horizon, a larger range of foresight, and a deliverance from provincialism. The thoughtful American citizen must think of his country and of his own place in it, not with a localized but with a continental habit of mind. His own affairs are inevitably and fundamentally concerned with distant wheat-fields, or trunk-lines of traffic, or international politics. His industrial energy must have behind it a capacity for vision, a fertile imagination, an ingenuity and expectancy, which make him not only a doer, but a seer. In other words, the very expansion of American commercialism quickens the native disposition to idealism. The man of business dreams of waving fields supplanting arid deserts, and presently his

railways and irrigation-plants make the desert blossom into farms. The inventor devises an instrument which seems to others a mere toy, but soon the continent becomes a whispering gallery and friend speaks to friend across the sea. The nations of Europe are plunged into tragic conflict and the United States looks on at a struggle with which she is unconcerned, until at last it becomes plain that neutrality is impracticable in a world so inevitably interdependent, and the very necessities of national commercialism urge the nation to an international idealism.

The effect thus produced on the American habit of mind by the magnitude of its problems is still further reinforced by observing the nature of those problems which are now most conspicuous in American life. The schemes and controversies which with each new year become more insistent have, as a rule, the form of industrial or political change, but within this legislative or economic form there is revealed in each of these agitations an interior spirit of ethical passion, a demand for equity, fraternity, or compassion, a protest against a dehumanized way of life. What is called the Labor Movement, for example, exhibits on the largest scale this twofold character. In its

form it is a question of wages, hours, or terms of pay, but within this economic form is the surging life of a multitude of wage-earners, protesting by strategy or force against what they believe to be inequitable or humiliating. The more radical programmes of social revolution exhibit in the same way a body and a soul. The economics of revolution may be impracticable and illusory, but no economic refutation is likely to check the revolt. The movement gets its interior momentum from motives of idealism, which may indeed be misdirected, but which cannot be diverted from their vision of a world of brotherhood and peace. No corrective legislation and no economic argument can be conclusive to those who have thrown themselves into the cause of social revolution, which do not satisfy the idealism of revolution with a saner and more practicable idealism wrought out of the existing conditions of industrial life.

Considerations like these, though they do not exclude the crudities or cruelties of a commercialized democracy, indicate that the heart of the people is still sound, and that even the marvellous expansion of American commercialism has in it the seeds of a worthier life. Whatever idealism may survive or flourish in the future must be attained, not by

retreating from the conditions of American civilization, but by trusting and developing them. Out of this money-making and materialized democracy must emerge the national character. The better America cannot be detached from the real America, like a flower tied to a stick, but must bloom from the same dark soil in which commercial success has taken root; and there are many signs that the plant which has seemed unlovely and even poisonous may, through the very forces which have conspired for its growth, blossom at last into fragrance and beauty.

The latest and perhaps the finest expression of this fundamental note in the American character is offered as these words are written. After years of patient and long-suffering neutrality the American people are summoned to abandon their commercial independence and to take their part in a world-war; and in words whose eloquence of phrase is matched by their depth of feeling the representative of American opinion speaks for a united country. "We have," he says, "no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights

of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of the nations can make them." What is this lofty utterance but an epoch-making statement of the essential idealism of the American morality? "We doubt," comments the leading English journal, "that if in all history a great community has ever been summoned to war on grounds so ideal"; and another adds, "The lofty dignity of language adds to the impressiveness of this international idealism." No nation need despair of itself when, in the greatest of emergencies, it hears such words spoken in its name and with full heart welcomes them. Even though it has been sorely tempted by the gain of the whole world, it has not lost its own soul. The taint of the dollar has not poisoned the springs of American idealism. There is strength and promise still in the American character.

# VII

## DISCIPLINE

If the sphere of American citizenship and the nature of the American character have been with any degree of accuracy defined, one is led, next, to consider the obstacles which confront that citizenship and the defects which that character is likely to show. The most obvious and threatening fault of the American character is its lack of Discipline. The American child is often self-assertive, irrepressible and unrestrained. The American youth is apt to be masterful, self-important and inconsiderate. The American man of business is in an unprecedented degree venturesome and self-confident. The American citizen applies his untrained mind without self-distrust to the profoundest problems of government and his undisciplined will to untried methods of reform. A distinguished American has said that his country is alone in the world in its distrust of experts. One man's opinion is commonly thought to be as good as another's, if not

better. A citizen may train himself laboriously for some form of public service, for diplomacy or legislation or the teaching of some branch of learning, and may find himself some day displaced by a wholly untrained competitor. When a candidate is proposed for office the first question asked concerning him is likely to be, not, "How adequately prepared is he for his task?" but, "Is he of our party; can he get the votes?" Inexperience may be a passport to preferment, and ignorance a title to self-respect.

With this lack of discipline it is not surprising that the American democracy, in spite of vast expenditures, multiplied legislation, and myriad schemes for social service, finds itself unprepared for any strain of political or commercial life. Prosperity has promoted recklessness; eagerness to give orders has anticipated willingness to take orders; audacity has displaced obedience; and confidence in the future has ignored the lessons of the past. Here is a manifest peril either for an individual or a nation. No country can be safe which commits its highest concerns to men whom no judicious business firm would trust with the direction of its affairs. Political wisdom cannot be expected from this casual and irresponsible habit of mind, which faces the future as though it were

a game or a jest. We speak of the lack of national preparedness for war, but it demands not less time and thought to train a nation for the problems of peace and the effective service of the common good.

What, then, is discipline; and how may it become operative in American life? It is a curious fact that the highest authority on the problem of religious education, though he gave his teaching under circumstances very remote from the conditions of to-day, was led to consider this very question and to answer it. There came one day to Jesus Christ a captain of the Roman army. It is probable that the two had never met before. Certainly the stranger knew nothing of the theology and little of the religion which Jesus had been teaching to his friends. Yet as this Roman captain meets the personality of Jesus Christ, he sees in it a leadership which commands his loyalty, and the soldier presents himself to the teacher as he might to his commanding officer. One can almost see him standing there, erect and alert, with his hand lifted in salute. When he speaks, it is as a captain to a general; and Jesus, as he listens to this man's self-confession, hears in it just what he needs for his own cause, and welcomes the Roman officer as an example for his own disciples. "I

have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."

It must not be inferred from this passing incident that Jesus was endorsing the profession of a soldier or surrendering his message of love to the methods of war. The purpose of Jesus was much more comprehensive than this approval of militarism. It was his habit to seize out of each vocation, as it lay before him, the spiritual lesson which each had to teach, and to hold up before his followers the significance even of the least praiseworthy pursuits. Jesus does not commend fraud because he tells how an ingenious steward was wiser than the children of light; or defend wealth because he says that a man with ten talents gains ten talents more. When he says, "Other sheep I have," he is not praising sheepishness; when he contrasts sheep with goats, he is not making a zoological discrimination. All nature and all life are to him symbols of the Kingdom he has come to found, and even those aspects of the world which seem most hostile to his mission are drawn by him into its service. Even the shrewdness of a dishonest servant, even the self-multiplying character of money, becomes a parable of the Kingdom. In other words, the thought of Jesus is not of the parts of life, but of the whole of it; not of one kind of experience, but of the whole of experi-

ence. In this spirit he meets a soldier. Here comes this Roman officer, with the habit of militarism wrought into his conduct of life, and in that attitude of the soldier Jesus discerns something that he needs in his religion, and draws a lesson for his disciples from the military career.

And what was it in this Roman captain which received from Jesus so quick and glad a welcome? It was his discipline. This soldier, as he says of himself, was a man under authority, having officers over him; and at the same time he was a man with authority, having soldiers under him. He received orders, and he gave orders. He obeyed and he expected to be obeyed. He had learned to take orders, and that gave him the right to command. His service in the ranks had given him that preparedness which now made him a captain. That is the difference between a soldier in an army and a man in a mob. Each person in the mob may be brave, but the mob scatters when the soldiers come because the mob is undisciplined. It has not been trained in the instinct of obedience, and so it lacks the power of control. No sooner, then, does this soldier state his military creed than Jesus sees in it the test of discipleship. Give me this soldierly discipline,

he says, where the habit of obedience has created the power of authority, and this discipline which prepares for war may be converted into a discipline which may create an efficient and self-controlled discipleship.

Such is the principle which Jesus carries over from the experience of a soldier into the experiences of life; and the same principle of discipline may be observed in its operations among the varied interests of the modern world. What, for example, is the problem of education? What is it to be educated? Why does one devote so much time and money to get for himself or his children an education? What is left of one's education when one has passed from school or college to the absorbing vocations of life? Much that one has learned — dates, facts, languages — has slipped away from one's mind like water off a roof. What then remains? There remains, if education has been wise, a mental habit, a discipline of mind, a capacity to attack new problems with confidence, a larger view of things, a more comprehensive aim. An educated person takes command of new situations and novel undertakings, as an officer takes command of his troops. And how is it that this capacity to command has been developed? It is reached through the training to obey.

The educated mind has been taught by greater minds and has felt the authority of greater thoughts. The laws of nature, the masters of literature, the great achievements of science or art, have taught one reverence and loyalty, and that acceptance of intellectual leadership makes one in his own time a leader. He has been a man under authority; and, therefore, when his own education comes to be tested he becomes a man having authority, to whom less educated minds turn as to one who is fit to lead. The educated man stands on the shoulders of the past and so looks farther into the future. He is saved from repeating old mistakes by knowing what the past has learned and has had to unlearn. He does not have to begin things; he is able to start with the momentum of the past.

Sometimes a man proposes to be an intellectual leader without a scholar's discipline. He thinks he has found some short-cut to knowledge, a miraculous invention, or a remedy for all diseases, or a final philosophy. Then his little venture sails out on the sea of the world, and soon its wreck lies stranded in the bookstores or the Patent-Office. This man was confident only because he was ignorant. He had not listened to the masters of truth, and so he

thought he was himself one of the masters. He had not acquired reverence for the greatness of truth and so he fancied that the truth was simple and small. A witty American once said, "It is easy enough to die for an idea if you have but one idea"; but suppose instead of one idea possessing your mind, you realize that many ideas must be combined and harmonized, then you need discipline to master the complexity of truth. The educated mind has submitted itself to the discipline of dull and uninteresting drill, and when such a mind in its turn is called to originate and produce it has intellectual preparedness, and says to its obedient thoughts: Go, Come, Do this; and all the forces of intellect and imagination obey.

Such is the soldierliness of the intellectual world,— the willingness to learn wrought into the capacity to teach. The same principle rules the entire conduct of life. The crises of experience arrive for the most part, not logically, gradually, or when expected, but with a terrific abruptness and an unanticipated demand. Out of a clear sky, without a word of warning, like a tornado rushing upon a sleeping town, the onset of disaster or temptation or sorrow comes, and the will calls for reinforcement, as though a sudden cry for help broke the quiet of the

night. What is it that steadies the will and rescues it from panic in these unforeseen and terrifying experiences which threaten to overwhelm one's life? It is the acquisition of an instinct for the right, which leaps to action as a soldier falls into his place at the call to arms, or a sailor grasps the right rope when the storm strikes.

And how is this instinct of rightly-directed action attained? To expect that it will arrive spontaneously and without preparedness is precisely as if a country should expect a million trained soldiers to spring to arms in a day. Self-control, patience, poise, sanity, is as much the product of discipline as is the soldier's efficiency when the crisis of the campaign arrives. Moral defeat and panic happen for the most part, not because one does not want to do right, but because he is not prepared to do right at the right time. Sin and sorrow are hard enough to face at any time, but what makes resistance to them hardest is that they take one by surprise. "What we call heroism," President Lowell has finely said, "the great deed of the moment, is the synthesis of life and character; and character is what you have been doing and thinking all your life." "Watch, therefore," says the Master of such experiences,

" for ye know neither the day nor the hour . . . and what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch."

And how is this discipline to be secured? It is the product of a habit of loyalty to ideals which cannot be disobeyed. Duty, integrity, chastity, honor, truth, self-control, self-sacrifice, — these are not gifts awaiting acceptance, they are powers to be trained; not calculations of expediency, or problems for discussion, but imperative laws like the law of gravitation, in obedience to which one finds security, uprightness, efficiency, and poise. To the life thus prepared there can be no shattering surprises. When the storm breaks, when hopes are defeated, when sorrow crushes, when sin allures, one does not have to improvise decisions. His conscience has learned to obey, and so it is now ready to command. It is what the Apostle described as a " good conscience," ready for emergencies, sleeping with its weapon at its side, a disciplined sentinel on the frontier of life.

Such, then, is discipline, not alone for soldiers whose business it is to kill, but quite as much for plain people in the modern world, who have to fight their own battles of the mind or heart. The teaching of Jesus goes, however, still farther; for it gathers up all these varied aspects of discipline, intellectual and moral, into a gen-

eral view of the whole of life as steadied and sustained by discipline. Observing this fitness to command wrought out of the willingness to obey, Jesus sees in this attitude of the soldier to his commander the same quality which in religion is called Faith. "I have not found so great faith," he says, "no, not in Israel." What a strange story of misinterpretation and complication the word faith recalls! How many Christians have been led to fancy that faith is a kind of intellectual consent, the acceptance of propositions which the reason may doubt or deny! Yet here is a Roman soldier who never heard of this kind of faith and who could not have repeated a single article of any Christian creed, but who comes to Jesus to receive orders, and in his turn to give orders; and Jesus says to the lookers-on, "This is what I mean by faith! This which this Roman captain calls soldierliness is what I want in my disciples." Faith, in other words, is not intellectual conformity or doctrinal confession; still less is it the opposite of science or reason. Faith, according to Jesus Christ, is an attitude of the will, a habit of mind, an instinct of loyalty, which responds to the summons of truth or duty as a trained soldier hears the word of command and stands at his post; and this discipline of the will,

this glad and prompt obedience, is what prepares one for self-command and for command of others, when one must either lead or be lost.

The same teaching is often heard in the Gospels. Jesus meets one day a woman of Canaan, who cries to him, "Have mercy on me; Lord, help me"; and Jesus answers her, "O woman, great is thy faith." A woman which was a sinner comes to him, bringing her offering of penitence, and Jesus says, "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." Neither these women, nor the Roman captain, could have repeated a creed which would have admitted them to any of the great churches in Christendom; yet all of them were, according to Jesus, saved by faith. Faith, that is to say, is not a matter of affirmation, but a matter of consecration. It is not a form which one holds, but a power which holds one. When the Apostle Paul says that we walk by faith, he expresses with precision the teaching of Jesus. Faith is not a way of talking, but a way of walking. It is not a problem to answer, but a path to follow. It is the habitual loyalty of a disciplined life to a loving and living God.

And that is what gives one command of himself and of experience when the tests of life arrive. It is a habit of mind which cannot

be taken by surprise; the dedication of the will not to do one's own will but the will of Him that sends one. That is what Jesus means by faith. Many truths may still remain unexplored, but the way is plain. "I am the Way," says Jesus; and along that way one walks by faith; as little aware, perhaps, as the Roman captain could have been, that his loyalty may be accepted as discipleship; perhaps not even confessing Christ as Leader; but taking orders in the ranks, and learning thereby to be a captain; and at last with a glad surprise hearing the Commander say: "I have not found, even where worship is most devout and creeds are most convincing, greater faith than here."

# VIII

## POWER

NEXT to the need of Discipline in the religious education of an American citizen comes the need of Power. Discipline is not an end in itself, it is a means to efficiency. Willingness to serve is accepted because it leads to power to command. It is often fancied that the religious life is of a powerless, passive, anæmic character; and Christian art has done much to perpetuate this ideal of a resigned and self-mortifying asceticism, a Man of Sorrows, a Lamb of God. When, however, the first hearers of Jesus reported their first impression of his teaching, they turned with constant reiteration to the word Power. Twenty-five times in the first three Gospels, and in the most significant connections, this word appears. "The multitudes glorified God," says Matthew, "which had given such power unto men." "The Kingdom of God comes with power," says Mark. "His word was with power," says Luke. The ministry of Jesus was, in other words, dynamic; he spoke as one having authority; he had power to lay down

his life and he had power to take it again. It is this quality which most commends Jesus Christ to a modern man. The ascetic habit of an ineffective saint, the self-centred concern with a personal salvation,— this which for thousands of the finest natures in the Middle Ages constituted the way of perfect discipleship,— the *vita religiosa* which could not be attained among the ordinary affairs of the working world,— cannot hope to command the loyalty of men who must work out the problems of their religious life in terms of citizenship. What they must have is not a willingness to abandon the world, but a power to redeem the world; not the gift of self-surrender only, but that of self-mastery; not a way of retreat, but a way of victory; not a leader who is a Lamb, but a leader who is a Lion; and they turn with a new confidence to that dynamic quality in the teaching of Jesus which drew his first disciples from their boats, their tax-booths, and their homes with the irresistible call of spiritual power.

But what was the secret of this power which was felt in the person of Jesus, and how can that power be transmitted and utilized by less inspired lives? In a passage of the Fourth Gospel, which is so penetrating and illuminating that it carries the assurance of authenticity,

Jesus himself answers this question. "My teaching," he says, "is not mine, but His that sent me. If any man will do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." The secret of his power, that is to say, was in its being not his own power. His teaching had been committed to him as to a messenger or interpreter; and the sense of being an instrument of Him that sent him gave confidence and conviction to all which he had to say. As he had surrendered his will to do the will of his Father, he had gained insight, wisdom, and power of his own. It would be the same, he said to his hearers, with any one of them. The teaching which was one's own would always be hesitating, timid, egotistical, unauthoritative. The teaching which consciously allied itself with the Source of Truth and which the teacher felt himself sent to give, would have in it confidence, self-effacement, and power. Any man who is willing to do, not his own will, but the will of Him who sends him, will find this dedication of the will transformed into authority and force, and may not only do the will but come to know the teaching as of God and not of himself.

Such is the Christian doctrine of Power; and it may be verified in many experiences and as-

pects of the modern world. Consider, for example, what happens in the intellectual life. One of the most perplexing and chastening discoveries which people of the academic circle sometimes have to make is the discovery of intellectual power and insight, literary force and charm, scientific attainment and fertility, where education has been meagre and circumstances barren and the privileges of the higher culture denied. It is as though a flower of startling beauty should spring from a heap of refuse or from a narrow crevice in the sterile rock. A student at the university, for instance, proposes to cultivate his taste in English literature, but when he looks for modern models of expression he finds, side by side with the academic perfectness of Newman or Matthew Arnold, of Lowell or Emerson, the Gettysburg Address of Lincoln, the Lyrics of Burns, or the Memoirs of General Grant. How could it happen that a rustic lawyer, or a vagrant singer, or a silent fighter, should become a master of the richness or rhythm or robustness of the English tongue? What does it mean that, in the latter half of the seventeenth century, there were in England but two great creative minds, and that one of these men was for eight years a student at Cambridge, and the other was a strolling and prof-

ligate tinker? Where did the apothecary Keats acquire his refinement of style, or the stone-mason's son Carlyle his power of denunciation; not to approach the perennial miracle of omniscient information and unerring touch in the butcher's son and strolling playwright, Shakespeare? How could it be that the university training which made Gladstone eloquent was matched by the thrilling appeal of the Quaker cotton-spinner, John Bright? Or when one turns from literature to science or philosophy in England during the last century, what does it mean that neither Spencer nor Mill, neither Faraday nor Huxley nor Tyndall, owed anything to those universities of which Macaulay wrote that Cambridge educated bishops and Oxford burned them?

What is to be said of this undiscriminating distribution of intellectual power? Must it be inferred that a liberal education is likely to stifle genius and to standardize mediocrity? A little girl in a New York school was asked the question, "What is the difference between an educated man and an intelligent man?" and wrote as her answer: "An educated man knows what other people think; but an intelligent man works his own thinks." Must it, then, be admitted that the ease and freedom

of the academic life, while it may promote education, may diminish intelligence, imparting the knowledge of what other people think and sapping the power to "work one's own thinks"? Fortunately for the world no such inference can be legitimately derived either from observation or from history. The higher education, even if it has not been able to convert base metals into gold, has refined and disciplined great numbers of minds. Nothing could be more foolish than any wholesale depreciation of academic training as unadapted to modern life. Nothing is more obvious than a new demand for the higher learning among the complex and baffling problems of the present day. No testimony to the worth of such a training is so appealing as the regrets of those who had to win their way without its aid.

But the saying of Jesus Christ is concerned with a much profounder problem than that of the differences between educated and uneducated men. It discloses the secret of intellectual power in educated and uneducated alike. It announces the place of the will in the operations of the mind. A system of education is an ingenious mechanism for the transmission of power. It is a Rapid Transit System, where the learning of the world may be expeditiously and

safely conveyed to the mind of youth. Its lecture-halls are power-houses for the generating of intellectual momentum; its studies are tracks to direct that power; its libraries and laboratories are wires for its transmission. Education, that is to say, utilizes power, economizes it, multiplies it, keeps it on the right track, reduces its risks. But whence comes the power itself? That is not a mechanical creation, but a personal inspiration. It is communicated, not by systems but by scholars, not by instruction but by contagion, wherever the will to teach touches with its electric spark the will to learn. The mysterious power generated in those personalities and those ideals constitutes the real university, and without that accumulated dynamic all the outward mechanism of transmission is impotent and dead.

It is the same throughout the history of the intellectual life. What gives any man his vigor of style, his insight into truth, his originality in research, is — as Jesus said — the dedication of his will to the task which commands his loyalty, so that he is able to say, "My teaching is not mine, but His that sent me." The author, poet, statesman, man of science, achieves his best, not because academic opportunities have been thrust upon him, nor yet

because these opportunities have been denied him, but because, with or without favoring opportunity, he has made himself an instrument of the truth, a priest — as Fichte said that every scholar should be — ministering at the altar of reality, giving his will to do the Will that sends him, and through that self-effacing dedication of the will coming to know that the teaching is not of himself. In other words, the chief obstacle to intellectual efficiency is not lack of brains but lack of power, and the secret of intellectual power is not genius but consecration. To attach one's will to a purpose larger than oneself, as though the trolley reached out to touch the source of momentum, heat and light, — that is to get power, either in the university or in the world.

And here one begins to understand that intellectual atrophy which may be sometimes observed in academic life, where the power to produce has shrivelled into the power to criticise, and a man who might have been a scholar has dwindled into a mere analyst, and become, — as Lowell said in his "Cathedral":

> "Child of an age that lectures, not creates,
> Plastering our swallow-nests on the awful Past,
> And twittering round the works of larger men,
> As we had builded what we but deface."

What is the cause of this paralysis of power, whose premonitory symptoms are seen in academic affectation and cynicism? It is the sign of the undetermined will, the lack of a cause to serve, the loss of motive, the desire to do one's own will rather than the will of Him who sends one. "I see our Oxford men," a scholar there has said, "afflicted with two defects: the not having any opinions, which they call moderation; and the not expressing their opinions, when they have them, which they call the balanced mind." What makes one's English style mincing and affected is self-consciousness, the conception of English as an art instead of a tool, a pose instead of a power. What makes one's decisions limp or his administration weak is the touch of self-interest, ambition, or envy, tripping up the will and vitiating the judgment. Such people, though they have much learning, have never learned. Their productive thought has been sapped by their feebleness of will, until at last they end their days lecturing and commenting on the works of men who may have been far less gifted than they, but who have written and taught and discovered what was not their own, but was committed to them to impart.

Such, then, for any one, young or old, is the

secret of intellectual power. Let him get into contact with a teacher, a subject, a purpose, an ideal, powerful enough to win a self-effacing loyalty; and then, as though the transmitting wire touched the responsive mind, efficiency, love of work, intellectual achievement, is his. It is not so much that he has taken hold of his task as that his task has taken hold of him. He is on the right track, and the work of life follows the way which has been discovered by the dedication of his will. Nothing is more surprising as one looks back after many years on the men of his own generation than to observe how efficiency has been attained by mediocrity and accession of power has been given to lives which in youth seemed far from extraordinary; and on the other hand, how some men who seemed at the outset sure of distinction have been smitten by intellectual atrophy and have never justified the hopes with which they began. Talent may fail and obscurity may shine. Hard circumstances may through their very friction stiffen the will to resistance, and soft circumstances may through their very non-resistance slacken the tension of desire. Just as the athlete finds his energies multiplied and his endurance prolonged when he runs not for himself but for his university or his team, so the

scholar's mind is quickened as it is applied not to do his own will, but the will of Him that sends him. He is saved from himself as he serves what is better than himself. His service, as the English Prayer-book says, becomes his perfect freedom. Whenever and wherever one's mind gives itself to serve a task which claims more than one can give, then, whether it be in the university or in the world, one's liberal education begins.

Such was the teaching of Jesus to the Rabbis of Jerusalem, the representatives of that academic orthodoxy which has its counterpart in the modern world. But like so many sayings of the Gospel the principle thus taught to one little group of listeners has larger applications. That is one of the most characteristic aspects of the method of Jesus. His teaching was for the occasion, the person, the moment, and the mind of the Master seemed fixed on the single soul and the immediate need. Yet in that incidental occasion the Teacher habitually discerns the working of a universal principle; and in his dealing with the single case he discloses the operation of a general law. So it is here. What is true of learning is true of life. The secret of power, whether it be intellectual, moral, or spiritual, is in attaching one's own life to a

source of power, and the utilizing of that dynamic of the larger Will. Efficiency, insight, patience, faith, self-control, are for those who commit their wills to the will of Him that sends them, and who through the doing of that will come to know that the teaching is of God and not of themselves.

Take, for example, the common course of a moral problem. One is beset — as who is not? — by a grave temptation, a moral issue, a critical problem of duty, and looks about for some reinforcement of power. How shall I resist this attack, one asks himself, whether it approach by downright assault, or by subtle strategy, or by slow and persistent siege? Sound instruction I have had, and good examples, and a clear understanding of right and wrong. These maxims have contributed to my moral education and have their place in steadying my mind. But now it is a question, not of knowing, but of choosing; not of doctrines but of determination; not of ethics but of power. What shall make one stand in his place and meet the charge? How shall one learn to resist, having never learned before? In such a crisis of character there is, Jesus answers, but one way of safety. It is in the reinforcement of the will from the reserves

of God. "My strength is not my own," one says, "but His that sends me." I am not left, like a picket at his post, deserted by a retreating column. I am set here in my place within the comprehensive purpose of the plan of God, and each act of my loyalty, in what seems an awful solitude, counts in the great campaign. To fight a moral battle which is all one's own is to court disaster; but to be sure that a Commander surveys the field, and that each private soldier, each skirmish, perhaps each defeat, is a part of the great design,— that steadies one in his place and saves one from panic and rout. Giving his will to do the will of Him that sends him, the lonely watcher on the skirmish-line may come at last to know what was the plan of the general when he trusted a post of peculiar danger to that special soul.

It is the same with other experiences. A life, for instance, has been smitten by some blow of fate, by physical infirmity, it may be, or by commercial disaster, or by domestic tragedy. What is there so appropriate to such an experience as a creed of despondency or despair? Why should not one curse God and die? What does it mean, then, that when we meet this kind of life, which seems to have been stripped of all resources of cheerfulness and hope, it turns

out so often to be blessed with a peculiar gift of cheerfulness, assurance, and power? How hath this man endurance, having so much to endure? How hath this woman serenity, having suffered so much? And stranger still, how does it happen that these very people who are bravely bearing their own burdens are precisely those who have committed to them the task — or rather, as they would call it, the added privilege — of bearing the burdens of other lives? The secret of these profound experiences is in the same law of life which insures both intellectual achievement and moral strength. The riddle of fate, the strain of care, the tragedy of sorrow, like the problems of thought and of conscience, become interpreted with serenity and confidence only as one is able to say: My life is not my own, but His that sends me. Human experience remains forever baffling and meaningless, an infant crying in the night, the tale of an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing, until it is lifted into this consciousness of a higher Will whose purpose calls for loyalty and whose service is perfect freedom.

It is difficult to think of anything in these tragic days without coming at last upon the solemn lessons of the war; and nothing has been more impressive in these awful years than to

observe the evolution of spiritual power which has occurred in millions of lives. Cruelty, barbarism, and incredible ruthlessness, have indeed been witnessed, but along with all this an amazing elevation of character has been everywhere attained. Old and young, men and women, rich and poor alike, have discovered in themselves a capacity for heroism and self-sacrifice, and a tranquil acceptance of sorrow, which would once have seemed even to themselves quite unimaginable, but which the new demand has made the normal way of life. "Countless thousands," a visitor at the Front has reported, "who had been infected with the poison of self-seeking, have learned that there are greater things in the world than riches and self-indulgence, and that happiness is found in active service of a great Cause." The frivolous temper which once seemed to dominate France, the partisan divisions which once seemed to threaten England, have been simply submerged by this vast wave of passionate devotion. "These are great days," one letter says, "in which to live in England." "It is a new France," another writes, "in which one is permitted to live." A young Russian student with eyes afire says, "The spiritual unity of Russia is the great gift of the war."

What is it that has wrought this spiritual good out of so devastating a calamity? How can it happen that a physical tragedy can lift people to such heights of moral power? It is because they have been delivered from themselves, from light-mindedness, from money-making, from divisive interests, so that these concerns which once seemed commanding have shrivelled into insignificance as the new call is heard. Many a man in the trenches has found a new sense of reality in prayer and a sacramental experience in suffering which have fed him with the bread and water of life. Many a woman is going her way with uplifted face and unveiled eyes, offering a broken heart as one more free gift to the greater purpose, as though her private sorrow were a widow's mite thrown into the treasury of a suffering world. How is it that these millions have learned fortitude, patience, and peace, having never learned these things before? It is because they have discovered at last that for which it is worth while to live and to die. What their own wills most desired may have been tragically denied, but their loyalty to the higher Will has taught them the privilege of sacrifice and the freedom of service. If any man, even in these awful days, is without reservation committed to

do the will of Him that sends him, he finds a new and unsuspected sense of power flooding into his life, and his own will is steadied, chastened, and cleansed.

Such is the miraculous way in which tragedy has taken us by the hand and led us to the truth. For this which war is teaching is nothing else than that which Jesus taught of the whole of life; and what we ought to have learned among the problems of peace is forced upon us by the stern schooling of war. This habit of mind, this steadying of will, this attitude of preparedness, this submergence of private aims in the rising tide of sacrifice,— this which has become now a natural way of life,— this is just the way one ought to be living all the time. This is the way of a religious education,— an emancipation from the transient and insignificant, and an association with the permanent. Personal religion, that is to say, begins, not in a creed, not in a form, not even in a perfect character, but in that clarification of thought, and amplification of duty, and purification of desire, which can issue from nothing less than the consecration of the will. The only atheism which one has to fear, in this or in any age, is the paralysis of the will, the surrender to circumstances, the loss of spirit-

ual momentum, as though one were a rudderless derelict on the ocean of time, with no port of one's own to reach and drifting straight across the track of other lives. The faith that saves, in America as in Judea, is that which first of all saves one from oneself, and commits his will to do the will of Him that sends him. That does not mean a refuge from the vicissitudes of life, as though one had reached a harbor where no storm can come; but it means at least this: that across the deeps of experience which must be traversed, and through the storms which are sure to come, one has a course to steer, a port to reach, and is set at his post to keep his rudder true.

# IX

## PERSPECTIVE

THE third mark of an American citizen who is on the way to a religious education is a quickened sense of spiritual perspective, a capacity to set things in their true proportion, to keep the great things great and the small things small. Without discipline character is unrestrained; without power it is impotent; but without the sense of proportion it is blundering, misguided, intolerant, or blind. The process of religious education begins with self-discipline, and through that discipline reaches an accession of power; but from that power and restraint there should issue a habit of discrimination, a just estimate of spiritual values, an application of this disciplined power to ends that deserve the loyalty of life. The Apostle Paul, writing to his young friend Timothy about the Christian life, tells him that one mark of a good workman, an "*operarius non erubescendus*," is that he "rightly divides" the word of Truth. He sees things, that is to say, just

as they are; he "cuts a straight road," as the Greek says, through reality. The workman who gets entangled in the thicket of his task ought to blush for his confusion. The workman who can find his way through his task, rightly divide its details, and adjust them in a comprehensive plan is, the Apostle says, "approved unto God."

Many a well-intentioned and scrupulous life fails of intellectual or moral efficiency through this lack of perspective. It is like a Chinese artist who in painting a plate makes the house smaller than the man who is to enter it, and the man in his turn larger than the bridge he is about to cross. Chinese perspective may be picturesque or decorative, but it does not seem to Western minds to divide rightly the elements in the picture. It is the same with life. Some features of its total scene may be over-magnified, and some over-depreciated, and the total result may be unreality or confusion or mere blur.

Consider, for instance, the discriminations of theology. Why is it that so many thoughtful people in the modern world find themselves unable to repeat with complete conviction the creeds and confessions which the theologians have so laboriously framed? Is it because

these statements of doctrine, which express the profoundest thoughts of many wise and pious men, have proved wholly indefensible or false? On the contrary, there are many indestructible truths about God and man which are formulated in the creeds of the Church; and either they or some substitute for them is essential to the satisfaction of any serious mind. No proposal of a mock-liberalism is more futile than the proposal to abolish creeds. Every reasoning being has a creed, if it be only the creed that all creeds are unreasonable. The only distinction which can be made is between a good creed and a bad one, between a rational religion and a magical religion. The satisfaction of the mind concerning the mysteries of the universe is as irresistible a demand for the intelligence as the satisfaction of hunger is for the body. To denounce one creed is to announce another; and to profess no creed is to confess that one has given up thinking.

When, however, one recalls these statements of Christian doctrine, is he not likely to observe in them something of that lack of proportion of which Paul wrote to Timothy? Propositions which have lost their significance for modern minds may seem to be given the same authority and weight as the sublimest affirma-

tions of eternal realities. Controversies which divided the Church of the third century may be set in the foreground of belief for the twentieth century. To believe in God the Father, Maker of Heaven and Earth, may seem to commit one to less verifiable statements concerning the resurrection of the body or the birth of Jesus Christ or his descent to the dead. The wrong division of the word of truth may, as Paul said, "overthrow the faith of some." To reject a part may seem to involve abandoning the whole, and because the thought of the third century cannot be revivified the Christian religion itself may seem a failure.

It is the same with much modern teaching. The divisions now maintained in the Church of Christ are, for the most part, not concerned with the spiritual problems of religious experience, but with the intellectual controversies of rival sects. How one should define Christ may seem more vital than how one should follow him. How the Bible is inspired may seem a more central question than whether the Bible inspires us. How one should be baptized with water may be a more absorbing question than whether one is baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. By what human hands one has been ordained may seem more important than

whether one is ordained of God. A workman who has devoted his piety and learning to these scaffoldings of faith should blush, not because he has done his work badly, but because he has not discriminated between the scaffolding and the building, the form and the fact. There may be truth in all that he teaches, but it is not a "rightly divided" truth. Each part may be real, but the proportion of parts may be mistaken. The first business of the Christian theologian, therefore, is to put truths in their places; to make the great things great, and the small things small; to fix the mind of the Church on central themes; to set what is sure in the foreground and what is debatable in the background; to group creeds round character, sects round a Savior, speculations round consecration, and at the focus of the picture of life the soul of man sustained by the Spirit of God. That is good theological perspective — a right division of the word of Truth.

This principle of perspective, however, is not for theologians only to take to heart. The same teaching has its place in the ordinary and personal problems of conduct and decision, of duty and desire. For when one considers the moral blunders and disasters which happen among decent people, he cannot help observing

that they occur, for the most part, not because wrong is consciously preferred to right, but because the proportions of right conduct are confused or blurred. The duty which is remote or imaginary may crowd out the duty which is immediate and supreme; until what might be right in the right place becomes wrong in its relation to the whole of life, and the total result is distortion or perplexity or despair.

A conscientious young man or woman, for example, may see plainly the heroism of missionary service, but may be blind to the prosaic occupations of a dependent home; a man of business may devise an admirable scheme of welfare for his employees, but may be indifferent to the conditions under which that wealth is created which he so generously divides; a conscientious citizen may be soft-hearted to public charities and hard to live with at home. Even a sincerely religious life, dedicated to the will of God, may be so preoccupied with eternity as to be a selfish neighbor or an irritable and anæmic saint.

In another of the letters to Timothy the Apostle Paul prays that his young friend may have "a good conscience"; and one might be led to ask: How can my conscience be bad? What can be better than conscientiousness? If

one obeys his conscience, is he not sure to do right? On the contrary, answers the Apostle, an undisciplined conscience with a moral decision to make may be as dangerous as an undisciplined soldier with a loaded gun. A conscience uninstructed may be as misleading as a conscience disobeyed. The will, like the mind, is not given ready-made, but given to be made ready. A bad conscience may be as dangerous as a bad man. History is strewn with the mistakes of conscientious people, who have been all the more persistent in their blundering because they were quite sure that they were doing right. Here is the pathos of many a sanguine adventure in social regeneration and of many a panacea for social ills. Such an undertaking may be prodigal in good intentions and conscientious in aim, so that its failure may leave behind it a sense of bewilderment that wrong can be so much stronger than right. Yet all the while the fatal defect was in bad perspective. One scheme or dream was set in the foreground of reform, and crowded out other motives and aims which were quite as legitimate and essential. And so it happens that temperance reform may be intemperate, and the brotherhood of labor may be unfraternal, and the crusade of women may be unwomanly, and the peace

party may be belligerent, and religion itself may be bigoted or provincial or even cruel.

At this point one is again confronted by the solemn teaching of these years of war. For among the many causes of the vast calamity,—political, diplomatic, industrial, and moral,—none is more unmistakable than the disproportionate pace of progress in which the modern world has been involved; the uneven step in which material and spiritual events have marched. On the one hand are the achievements of science, of wealth, of industrial organization and of centralized control, offering themselves with unprecedented abundance and efficiency for the service of man; while on the other hand may be observed a slackening of moral fibre, a loss of spiritual momentum, a contempt of moral idealism. The things which are external, material, and commercial have accumulated beyond all precedent; while the things which are spiritual and ethical have been ignored or despised. To what, then, could this uneven pace of progress lead but to calamity? The greater the advance of technical achievement, the more terribly it could be applied to destruction. As science grew more inventive, its consequences grew more horrible. Unprecedented material gain coinciding with

decreasing moral restraint could have no other end but tragedy. Civilization had become distorted and diseased. The more men knew or had, the more of other men they could kill. The workmen in statesmanship or militarism who should be most proud of the structure they were building became workmen who needed most to blush because they had not rightly divided the truth committed to their care.

There remains an opposite aspect of this doctrine of perspective which brings it closer to one's personal affairs. Instead of overmagnifying the remote and overlooking the near, the view may be reversed and the near may crowd out the far. Instead of surveying the world as through a telescope and seeing only the stars, one may hold his hand before his face and shut out the light. This is that subtle temptation which besets the discouraged, the introspective, or the saddened life, where the near approach of anxiety or sorrow eclipses the light beyond. Disappointment invades one's experience, failure embitters, solitude crushes, and in this darkness of the soul the universe itself seems black, and the easy faith of sunny days tragically false. "Behold and see," cries the darkened soul, "if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow." The sense of proportion becomes lost,

the perspective of life becomes distorted; and the problem which confronts one — a solemn and tragic problem — is to readjust these personal incidents in their larger relationships, to restore the balance of things, to regain poise of judgment, to set the great things in the centre of interest and the little events of one's personal affairs in their true perspective.

And this, again, is one of the many lessons which the world may learn through the solemn teachings of these days of war. Overwhelming and irremediable as is this vast calamity, it seems not improbable that there may emerge from it at least a new sense of proportion among those things for which it is worth while to live or to die. In the ordinary course of events it may be hard to believe that anything is more important than one's own disappointments, sorrows or fears. The whole system of things seems to revolve round one's own concerns, as the ancients thought the sun moved round the world. When, however, in the mysterious providence of God, a vast catastrophe forces upon one the larger view, each single experience finds itself swung into its orbit round the larger centre. The great ends of life — honor, justice, sacrifice, faith,— open before whole nations in a hitherto undreamt-of magni-

tude, and many a problem which one had thrust into the foreground of his thought takes its place in the obscure background of desire. Divisions of Christian sects, controversies of Christian theology, animosities of race or religion, prejudices of social classes,— these hot debates and burning issues which have seemed supremely critical, are at last seen just as they are, not as unreal, but as altogether subordinate to the great ideals which persuade and ennoble the higher life of man. "I cannot shake off the conviction," an American prophet has lately said, "that in this world-shaking war God is sifting out the true from the false Christianity. . . . It is being forced home upon the reasons and consciousnesses of men to-day that a primarily theological Christianity, a primarily emotional mystical Christianity, a primarily ceremonial Christianity, a Christianity which adopts God as a kind of national perquisite, and an Old Testament kind of Christianity — have all alike failed to stand the test of these crucial days." [1]

This is the secret of that wonderful sense of spiritual enlargement and emancipation which is in these years being attained by

[1] H. C. King, *Fundamental Problems*, Macmillan, 1907, p. 240.

many a soldier at the Front. Men who are face to face every hour with eternity are not likely to return from these solemn realities of war and to care very much for the wranglings of Christian creeds, or the distinctions of Christian rituals, or the differences among Christian sects, which may have once seemed of momentous interest. Three years ago, for example, the Church of England seemed almost threatened by disruption because a missionary bishop in Africa had partaken of the Lord's Supper with other missionaries on whom a bishop's hands had not been laid. It is difficult to imagine that at the end of the war there should be any revival of interest in a controversy like this. Important as it may still appear to some belated ecclesiastics, the world which shall survive the war will be thinking of greater things. As the supreme ends of life have been revealed, its minor issues are seen in a true perspective; and the teacher who shall interpret that new world must rearrange reality, redistribute emphasis, and divide in more just proportions the word of truth. "The world," an English observer concludes, "that will emerge will be a world that will be new and strange. . . . It will be a profoundly serious world. . . . We shall be concerned not

about the decorations of life, but about the foundations. Men who have seen the very skeleton of civilization face to face . . . will come back with a new light in the mind and a sense of authority that they never had before." [1]

To this testimony of a looker-on may be added the still more appealing witness of that gallant "Student in Arms" who had hardly uttered his new faith when he was struck down in battle. Writing of his comrades, with all their varied traditions and limitations, often rough-tongued and undevout, Donald Hankey, in the very presence of his own cross and passion, said: "Of the Church in which I believe they are members, whether they know it or not. . . . If these were not good, the Student is a blasphemer. He believes in the Holy Catholic Church invisible, wherein is and shall be gathered up 'all we have hoped and dreamed of good.' He also calls himself an English Churchman. But he will never be satisfied until the Church of England is the church of all good men and women in England, and until all the good thoughts and deeds in England are laid at the feet of the Lord of all good life." [2]

[1] A. G. Gardiner, *The War-Lords*, Dent, 1915, p. 94.
[2] *A Sudent in Arms*, Dutton, 1917, p. 216.

And if these sad times thus set in the foreground of thought the great ideals of religion, may they not, with the same firm touch, put in their proper place the disasters and distresses of one's own affairs? Why exaggerate the proportions of one's experiences? "Why so hot, little man?" said Emerson. The very dimensions of the world-calamity set one's own troubles in the background of life. How shall one repine or weep when tragedies beyond his imagination are devastating millions of hearts and homes? Shall he not restrain his own sorrow and give himself to the worthier task of saving others from the wreck of the world? Shall he not sanctify himself anew for others' sakes? Is not the strange paradox of the Christian life again fulfilled, and one's own burden borne the better by adding to it one's share in the colossal burden of the time?

This, then, is what it means to have spiritual perspective; to be, as the Apostle Paul said, a workman who has no need to blush; to divide in right proportion the word of truth. And what is the secret of this good workmanship, this art of life? How does it happen that one may attain this self-control and self-subordination, which enables one to see things as they really are? The Apostle Paul, in the same

passage, answers that question. He bids the workman at the task of life study to show himself "approved unto God." In other words, the secret of good work is that one is not working for himself, or on work for which the praise is sought by him. He is not his own master, but God's workman; and each day he submits his work to God's approval. He takes his own little life, that is to say, with its problems and perplexities, its successes and disasters, and holds it up in the light of the Eternal Purpose, to see it as a part of the universal plan. Then things fall into their places; one sees them as they are, not as in themselves central and final, but as contributory to the larger aim, wrought into the structure of a design which the workman may not wholly understand, but in which he is permitted to share. His own work may seem fearfully incomplete, but it is done "as ever in the great Task-Master's eye," and the Master puts it in its place within the larger plan where it fits in as into a puzzle-picture of the experience of life.

That is religion,—the habitual consciousness of a real, even though a very humble, part in the purpose which God has for His world. One is not a drifting atom in a purposeless universe, but held in the cosmic order of moral

as of physical law. And that is the secret of courage and self-control. One's life is for oneself to build, but the plan of it is given him, and the test of it is to approve it to the Designer. Ambition is converted into loyalty, and insufficiency is lifted into power, and imperfect knowledge is sustained by the sense of proportion and reality in one's task. It is — to turn once more to the teaching of the war — as though a soldier were doing his "bit" in the great campaign, while back of the fighting-line stood the Commander where He could survey the entire field. Each man is set at his own post, not because it is safe there, nor yet because it is a post of distinction, but simply because that is the place where the General has determined that a special work must be well done. That is what keeps the soldier firm when the strain arrives, and calm when things go hard. He is not a solitary sentinel left to guard a deserted post; he is just where he is needed, and where, if he be a coward, the enemy may break through. He is not expecting that the great victory shall occur just where he happens to be; he wants the Commander's plan as a whole to succeed; and if his own little skirmish is manfully fought, and he holds fast to his own trench,— ignorant, it may be, of the

greater movement farther down the line,— the time may come when he shall at last stand before the General, and look without a blush into his Commander's face, and be approved of Him.

# X

## THE EXPANSION OF RELIGION

THE religious education of an American citizen is promoted by each conscientious home, each experience in college or in the world which fortifies moral idealism, each disclosure of the American character, and each personal acquisition of spiritual discipline, power, and perspective. These successive aspects of an enlarging experience bring one, however, into view of an enlarged conception of religion itself, an expansion of religion beyond the limits of all segregated or specialized types, and covering the entire area of human experience and need. A college teacher received some years ago on almost the same day two letters, which at first reading appeared to deal with totally different subjects, but of which the second letter seemed, on reflection, a kind of answer to the first. The first letter represented that alarming habit of young Americans, in school or college, who in the course of preparation for some academic duty — a debate, it may be, or an essay, or

what is sometimes in educational circles called with playful exaggeration, an "original research"— send letters of inquiry to many busy people, tabulate the replies, and present the result as their own production, when in reality it is the work of their innocent victims. This ingenuous youth propounded the following question, which he had no doubt asked of many teachers elsewhere: "How many Christians in your University go into athletics?"

What did he have in mind in this inquiry? Did he wish to know how many young men played their games honorably and generously, so that Jesus, looking upon them as he once looked on a young man, would love them? On the contrary, the context of the letter indicated that what the writer had in mind was not an inquiry into the character of student-life, but a technical and ecclesiastical question, concerned with a region of experience set apart from ordinary affairs. It was as if he had inquired how many Baptists owned automobiles; or how many Democrats went to the ball-game. The Christian life seemed to him to occupy one area of life, and the athletic life another; so that one might come out of the first and "go into" the second. It was as though one were travelling on a vestibuled train, where one stepped over an

intervening space and passed from the Christian life to the athletic life, as one might sleep in one car and eat in another.

The second letter was from quite another type of correspondent, a mature and thoughtful man, who wrote to deplore what he called the provincialism of Christianity. He was impressed by the meagre use made of the great heritage of faith, the segregation of the Christian religion within a limited province of the spiritual world. Provincialism is a familiar social fault. One finds himself some day in a little village and listens to the talk of the town,— of crops and rains and roads, of neighborly gossip and village politics; and one says to himself: "These are very interesting questions, but how provincial they are! Why does one hear nothing of the great affairs of modern life, its national duties and international perils, the wars of nations and of industry, the aims of literature and art, the ideals of society and religion? These larger interests of the world come surging up against this little self-centred community like waves breaking upon a beach, and ebb as they rise without visible impression on its shallow shore, or at the most only touching it with a dash of spray."

Thus the second letter proved to be a kind of

answer to the first. What was it which made the inquiry about religion and athletics unprofitable and discouraging? It was its provincialism. The youth had been led to believe that religion occupied a corner of life, where the special interests of church or creed, the local gossip of sect or form, might satisfy the minds of its disciples. He fancied that there was a wall between the religious life and the athletic life, and a door through which one might pass from the one and "go into" the other. He had set religion apart from life, when it was given him to be put into life. He had identified religion with ecclesiastical mechanics, when religion is, in fact, a form of spiritual dynamics. He had not realized that the Christian life, instead of being an alternative to athletics, is itself an athletic life. When the Apostle Paul describes the Christian character he uses the language of athletics. "I keep under my body," he says, "so fight I, not as one that beateth the air"; "So run that ye may obtain"; "I have finished my course; I have fought a good fight." That is at once the Christian doctrine of the athletic life, and the athletic doctrine of the Christian life. The Christian does not go into athletics. He is already fighting a good fight; running a straight race; wrestling against wickedness in high

places. When the Catholic saint, Ignatius Loyola, compiled his book of prayers, he called them "Spiritual Exercises." They were the athletics of the soul. The Christian does not neglect his body for the sake of his soul; he does not "come out" of his faith when he "goes into" a game. His character is consistent; that is, it stands together. It is one life that he offers to God, his muscle with his mind, his sport with his soul.

When one turns to the New Testament he observes that precisely this contrast between a provincial and a cosmopolitan religion gave its characteristic note to the teaching of Jesus Christ. The Scribes and Pharisees had set their religion in a province of its own, in the synagogues and Rabbinical Schools, with their prescribed duties of ritual and ceremonial law. Jesus opened a door from these restrictions of faith into the fresh air of nature, home, work, and play. "Ye tithe mint and anise," he said, "and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith." "Ye hold fast the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups . . . making the word of God void through your tradition." To give religion room to breathe, to abolish the distinction between secular and sacred, to sanctify

the whole of life, to welcome the Samaritan who stoops to serve and to condemn the Levite who passes by on the other side, to proclaim a universal Kingdom whose priests are the peacemakers and the pure in heart,— that was the offence of Jesus which made the leaders of his people cry: "Crucify him, crucify him; he stirreth up the people. And their voices prevailed."

When one proceeds from the Gospels to the Letters of Paul, he finds the same teaching even more specifically given. Writing, for instance, to the little company of his fellow-disciples in the great metropolis of Corinth, an obscure congregation of humble folk in a centre of Greek culture and commerce, he does not say to them: "Beware, my friends, of Corinth,— its wealth and luxury, its superstition and worldliness; keep yourselves apart from this heathen world." On the contrary, he proposes to that little company of Christians the more heroic task of winning Corinth itself to their cause. "All things," he says, "are yours,— the whole busy life which surrounds you, its trade, its philosophy, its art, its business, its games,— all this is yours, to be possessed and redeemed by the cleansing power of the new faith." The problem of the Christian was not

to be saved from Corinth, but to save Corinth itself.

Nor does the Apostle state this truth in general terms alone. He proceeds to enumerate many details in which the expansion of religion may be fulfilled. He observes, first, the divisions which had already begun to appear among the Christians themselves. Some said they were of Paul, some had joined themselves to Apollos, some were followers of Cephas. It was the beginning of sectarianism; the definition of Christianity under some special type of doctrine or form. What does the Apostle say of this primitive sectarianism? How shall the Christian regard these conflicting sects? They are all yours, answers Paul, whether of Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas. The sects, in other words, are cross-sections of the Church, which like cross-sections of a tree may represent truth horizontally, but give no picture of its longitudinal growth. You cut a tree across, and each cut shows by its rings and fibre the character and age of the tree; but no cross-section shows the entire tree with its expanding roots and its waving branches. It is the same with the sects. Each is a section of the whole, but each is a cross-section. To cut a tree across is to cut it down. To grow and outgrow and grow to-

ward the light is the nature alike of a living tree and of a living Church. All sects are yours, says Paul to his brethren; yours is not a provincial but a cosmopolitan faith; yours is the great confession: I believe in the Holy Catholic Church. Do not confuse catholicity with conformity. The province of the Christian Church is the whole of life. The Kingdom of God, said Jesus, is like a great tree, and in the shadow of that comprehensive and expanding growth all weary souls may rest.

Nor does the Apostle limit himself to this teaching of an expanding Church. Beyond the sects of Christians he sees the tumultuous life of the world, with its business, its luxury, its work, its wealth, its poverty. The world, Paul says to his friends, is yours,— yours to interpret, to cleanse, and to save. There are, in short, two ways in which the Christian may conduct himself toward the world. One is the way of retreat. The world is bad and the saint must run away. This is the view of life which peopled the deserts with hermits and monks, and drove the choicest souls of the Middle Ages to find refuge from the world.

> "Lust of the world and pride of life,
> They left it all behind,
> And hurried, torn with inward strife,
> The wilderness to find."

But did this retreat from the world solve the problem of duty? On the contrary, it surrendered its duty, and left the world to be redeemed by less competent lives. It was magnificent, but it was not war. The other way, then, to deal with the world is to accept it as the appropriate sphere for a gallant Christian life, and instead of saving oneself out of the world to set oneself to save the world. The world is yours, says the Apostle. If you are not master of your world, then you are either a refugee from it or a slave in it.

Nor is it the world alone which is the province of the Christian. Life, Paul goes on to say, is yours; that interior world of mind and will, of temptations and ideals, which make of the most prosaic experience a drama, a battle, or a tragedy. As one passes a throng of people on the street, it is startling to reflect what conflicts, what adventures, what disasters, their apparently undramatic lives represent; and there are those who teach that one is helpless in the hands of these circumstances, and must be what his conditions make him. A girl is poor, so she has to sin; a man is involved in business, so he has to cheat; a home is quarrelsome, so it must be shattered by divorce. All this, says the Apostle Paul, is the provincialism of philoso-

phy. We are not the slaves of life, but its masters. Circumstances, indeed, modify character; but character may turn on its circumstances and make of them what it will. One is not a puppet, a pawn, a cog in the wheels of life; he is a creator, a laborer together with God, a partaker of the Divine nature. The province of his religion is the whole of his life. And death, adds Paul, its perennial enigma, its desolating solitude,— this too is yours. If the world and life have been yours, if you have had a religion which takes command of circumstances, then death also is yours, and you may repeat the Apostle's song of praise, "Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory."

Finally, proceeds this summary of discipleship, things present and things to come are yours. A rational view both of the present and of the future is the natural issue of the Christian life. Is it possible, one is tempted to ask, that this confidence of the first Christian century can be revived in the twentieth century, when the tragedy of war is devastating Europe, and laying in ruins not its cities alone, but its Christian ideals of faith and hope and love? Whither are things present leading, and what are to be the things to come? Are we not witnessing the bankruptcy of Christianity? Have

we not been swept back into an era of barbarism, in which Christian faith has been submerged and lost?

The first impression which one may thus receive of the present may well make him tremble for the future. Yet when one considers more closely the origins of the present tragedy a different conclusion may be reached. What is it that has brought about this cataclysm? Behind all the diplomatic strategy and political ambition which have provoked the carnage, there lies a long series of moral wrongs, which have left their stamp on national honor and their scars on neighboring States. The awful catastrophe is the inevitable consequence of captured provinces, broken treaties, and cynical aggression. Never was there such a fulfilment of the warning of Moses to the children of Israel: "Behold, ye have sinned against the Lord: and be sure your sin will find you out." Each tortuous negotiation, each broken pledge, now finds its delayed and terrific retribution. The doctrine that statesmanship lies outside the area of the moral law could have, it now appears, no other consequence than this apparently uninterpretable war.

If, then, the United States, as it throws its

life and treasure into the abyss, is to have any part in the redemption of the world, it must be because her motives are wholly disinterested, her ambition wholly restrained, and her diplomacy wholly open and just. If things present are the awful penalty for national provincialism, then things to come must be the world's penitent answer to the great command, "Seek first the Knigdom of God and His righteousness." The tragedy of these years is teaching the world that the greatness of nations is not in force, but in faith; not in wealth, but in character; not in territory, but in truth. If the war is the logical consequence of detaching a great era of life from the sphere of Christian duty then stable peace will not arrive until political action becomes a part of that Christian cosmopolitanism which claims the promise, "All things are yours."

Such is the New Testament teaching of the expansion of religion. One may make of his religion as much or as little as he may please. He may sidetrack it, provincialize it, departmentalize it, save himself by it; or he may expand it, universalize it, set it to save the world; and the first question which any one who accepts the guidance of religion has to ask of himself is: Am I using my faith for all that it is

worth? Is it a personal privilege or is it a social obligation, a jewel to keep or a seed to sow, a provincial or a cosmopolitan possession? "Religion," as the Scotch teacher already cited has said, "prescribes no new duties: it has no province of its own, separate from the rest of life. But it gives a new significance to duty, and a new intensity to our aims." [1]

Much Christian teaching is still in effect social pessimism. It distrusts the spirit of the present age; it is suspicious of new learning; it hides itself from the movement of events as the monks once fled from an evil world to the security of their cells; and the consequence of this habit of mind is the practical exclusion of four-fifths of human life from the province of religion. The world, and life, and things present, and things to come, occupy a region which may be governed by expediency, utility, or self-interest; and the mind of the Church may be devoted either to technical discussions of doctrine or to meditations on death and eternity. Religion, thus interpreted, is like a great cathedral standing in the busy market-place of a European town. Within is prayer, incense, worship, miracle. Without is trade, toil, gossip, duty. One may lift the heavy curtain that hangs on the

[1] Henry Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

church-door and go in to God; and lift it again and come out to man; but between the sacred and the secular the curtain hangs. Within is darkness and mystery; without is sunshine and reality; and for the most part the people sit outside, in the warm sunshine of work and play, and leave the dim aisles of religion to the theologians, the reactionaries, and the sentimentalists. Over against this religious separatism stands the cosmopolitanism of Christianity. "The field," said Jesus to the provincialism of his own day, "is the world." "All things are yours," adds Paul. Holiness, in other words, is but another name for wholeness. No life is whole that is not holy; and no life is holy that is not whole.

We hear much in these days of the conservation of our national resources, the utilization of the powers of nature for the work of the modern world; and with amazing inventiveness and energy the waterfalls have been harnessed to their tasks, the deserts have bloomed into gardens, and the forests have been rescued from desolation and waste. Yet all the while, a natural resource of unparalleled energy — the religious nature of man — is left to operate in a corner of the world, instead of being utilized to the maximum of its productive power. The

problem of the modern Church is therefore not to permit its energy to be exhausted in turning its own wheels, or to be utilized by little people for little ends, but to set this vast natural resource, like some great water-power, to move and light and warm the modern world.

On the Canadian side of the Falls of Niagara stands a great power-plant from which the electric force is conveyed half across the State of New York. In a great silent hall a row of dials indicate these vast operations, and quiet men pass from one dial to the next, watching to see whether the power works without hindrance hundreds of miles away. Thousands of busy people live and move through the utilization of this force, while but a few inches are taken from the top of the Falls, and the mighty cataract thunders down in undiminished glory. It is a picture of the work of the Christian religion in the modern world. For centuries people have worshipped in the Christian name, just as people have come to gaze at Niagara; but at last the time has come to utilize the power that has run to waste, and to apply its energy to the wheels of the world. Each quiet place of worship becomes thus a power-house, where the dynamic is developed and from which it is transmitted; and far out into the waiting world, with all its needs

and desires and tragedies and fears, reaching in its mysterious course farther than can be believed or dreamed, the stored-up energy may flow, not to renew one's own strength, nor for the sake of one sect alone, be it of Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas,— but for the sake of the world, and life, and death, and things present, and things to come; and it is as though the power went singing along the wires: "I am come that all these may have my life, and may have it abundantly."

# XI

## THE CONVERSION OF MILITARISM

WITH each step in these successive chapters the discussion finds itself more and more overwhelmed by thoughts of war. It is as if a great cloud lifted itself above the horizon of a sunny day and hid from view one landmark after another in its black and threatening approach. Any lesson one may have to learn or teach, any prophecy he may make of the future, even the vocabulary he employs, becomes militarized. He cannot write of Discipline or Power or Perspective without being led into illustrations from the army or the battlefield. Indeed, one of the minor effects of the war upon preachers and teachers of religion is the increasing sense of inadequacy and futility in all that they have hitherto had to say. A kind of homiletical atrophy has seized on their earlier habits of thought and utterance. Themes which once appeared to them of supreme importance now seem to belong to another era, or another world. An Oxford professor is said to have stopped short in his lecture on philosophy and told his

class that the thought of the war had driven every idea out of his mind.

This overwhelming preoccupation with the tragedy of the time has reached its climax for American citizens through the actual participation of their country in the conflict itself. The motives which have prompted the United States to abandon its attitude of comfortable neutrality and to sacrifice its life and treasure are as far as possible from war-like. It is to end war rather than to promote it that Americans are preparing to fight. The action they propose is not an expression of militarism, but a protest against it. All Americans are thus, in the strict sense of the word, pacificists,— that is to say, peace-makers, pledged to secure a world-peace, even if it must be by the stern ordeal of war. On the flag of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is inscribed a motto which precisely represents the American spirit in this unsought and vast adventure: "*Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem.*" It seeks an undisturbed peace, with liberty on sea and land, by the undesired mediation of the sword. Such is the only kind of war for which the American people could be enlisted with the passionate loyalty which the crisis demands,— a war for peace, a crusade against militarism.

Yet the question may still be asked whether the spirit of militarism is altogether evil. A military caste, a militant nation, a "Will to Power," a conception of progress as dominated by force,— all this is indeed a blot on civilization and a reversion to barbarism. No end of the present conflict can be contemplated with hope which does not make an end of arrogant and merciless militarism. It is obvious, however, that neither diplomacy nor discipline could so confidently summon a civilized nation to war, if there were not operating, together with the brutal or mercenary motives of bloodshed, some finer elements of national character. War would indeed be intolerable if it were not, or at least did not pretend to be, the expression of national idealism.

And here we come upon the secret of strength, and, as history would seem to teach, of perennial vitality in the spirit of militarism. War is the most direct and immediate outlet for the splendid virtues of heroism, sacrifice, and patriotism. Militarism as a national creed becomes but another name for national honor, security, and unity; and for these ends any loyal citizen should be glad to die. On these lofty spiritual motives statesmen and strategists rely. They are not only dealing with

man as a fighting animal, inheriting from countless generations the instinct to conquer and slay, but reckon also on the transmutation of the fighting instinct into a spiritual aim, and on the willingness to fight because one's country is threatened or one's cause is just. Motives like these are not to be abolished or suppressed. They are not only ineradicable, but they are also justifiable and honorable. It would be a tame, materialized, and selfish world which did not respond to the appeal of the heroic, the self-abnegating, and the sacrificial. "Militarism," said William James in his noble essay on "Moral Equivalents for War," "is the great preserver of our ideals of hardihood. . . . War represents the strong life. . . . The military feelings are too deeply grounded to abdicate their place until better substitutes are offered."

What, then, is the problem which lies behind all temporary schemes for checking the passion of militarism, and which will confront the world when the immediate tragedy of the present war has ceased to devastate and bewilder? It is a problem which may be described as the Conversion of Militarism: the diverting of the military instinct from uses which are cruel and destructive to uses which are creative and beneficent.

Precisely as a natural force like electricity has been first worshipped in the clouds, then guarded against in the lightning-rod, and finally accepted as a perilous yet serviceable instrument of human welfare and convenience; precisely as the passion of sex, which may be the curse of civilization, is none the less the constructive force of every loving and stable home; so the fierce impulses which stir nations to war have in them the possibilities of application to mercy instead of misery, to beneficence instead of ruin, to life instead of death. Ventures not less heroic, gallantry not less splendid, battles not less perilous, await men in the fields of science and service, of creation and redemption, than on the bloody plains of Belgium and Galicia. "Much remains to conquer still," said Milton to Cromwell, "Peace hath her victories no less renown'd than war."

And how is it possible that this conversion of militarism may be practically secured? The suggestion seems at first merely fanciful. The tradition of bloodshed is so deeply rooted in the habits of the human race that it is difficult to think of soldiers as doing anything but kill, or of courage as being applicable to anything but war. Is it essential, however, to a hero that he should kill or be killed? Is

bloodshed the only test of bravery? Must courage be always associated with carnage? Or is it possible, among the ordinary demands and needs of a nation at peace, to find outlets for heroism, ways of the noble life, as real and perhaps as difficult as the courage of the trenches? That is the question which must be answered if the world, however sick at heart it may be, is not to permit its most gallant youths in their highest moods to be attacked by the fever of militarism, and to yield themselves to the passions of war.

In Professor James's prophetic Essay he proposes a daring, and — as it then seemed — a Utopian programme. It was nothing less than the universal conscription of young men of military age for service in an army of national defence; but in an army which should be applied to the constructive service of the common good. They should be ordered out from their comfortable and indolent lives and set to do the unwelcome tasks which must be done in a civilized community, and which might test the "hardihood of youth." "If now," he says, "there were, instead of military conscription a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against nature, the injustice would tend

to be evened out and numerous other goods to the Commonwealth would follow. The military ideals of hardihood and discipline would be wrought into the growing fibre of the people; no one would remain blind, as the luxurious classes now are blind, to man's real relations to the globe he lives on, and to the permanently sour and hard foundations of his higher life.

"To coal and iron mines, to freight trains, to fishing fleets in December, to dishwashing, clothes-washing and window-washing, to road building and tunnel making, to foundries and stokeholes, and to the frames of sky-scrapers would our gilded youth be drafted off, according to their choice, to get the childishness knocked out of them, and to come back into society with healthier sympathies and soberer ideas. They would have paid their blood-tax, done their own part in the immemorial human warfare against nature, they would tread the earth more proudly, the women would value them more highly, they would be better fathers and teachers of the following generations.

"Such a conscription, with the state of public opinion that would have required it, and the many moral fruits it would bear, would preserve in the midst of a pacific civilization the manly virtues which the military party is so

afraid of seeing disappear in peace. We should get toughness without callousness, authority with as little criminal cruelty as possible, and painful work done cheerily because the duty is temporary and threatens not, as now, to degrade the whole remainder of one's life."

When these gallant words were written, in 1910, they may well have seemed the imaginative forecast of a speculative philosopher. Governmental socialism on so vast a scale, drafting for public service the entire body of American youth, must have appeared as remote from practical politics as it was opposed to the habit of free initiative so dear to the American mind. Yet, by the inevitable logic of events, the United States has found itself brought at least within sight of a conception of citizenship which may go far to realize the scheme of political education so graphically described. The "selective draft," now proposed for national defence, is designed, not only to enlist an adequate fighting force, but to establish the principle which the President of the United States lays down: "That there is a universal obligation to serve, and that a public authority should choose those upon whom the obligation of military service shall rest, and also in a sense choose those who shall do the rest of the nation's

work." Such a scheme, if realized, would be "a mobilization of all the productive and active forces of the nation," in which "those should be chosen for service in the army who can be most readily spared from the prosecution of other activities in which the country must engage in, and to which it must devote a great deal of its best energy and capacity." Here, then, is not indeed a supplanting of war by its moral equivalents, but at least a recognition that the organization of militarism may be applied to other ends than war, and that there may be a soldierliness of peace. It repeats in the most dramatic tones the expectant patriotism of William James. "We must make new energies and hardihoods to continue the manliness to which the military mind so faithfully clings. Martial virtues must be the cement; intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interests, the rock upon which States are built."

So far, then, we have been led toward the conversion of militarism. The possibility of moral equivalents for war has been recognized not as a Utopian dream, but as a proposition of political expediency. The State of New York, for example, by recent amendment of its Military Training Law, permits its boys from 16 to 19 years of age to select as the equivalents of

drill and tactics " such vocational training or experience as shall specifically prepare boys of the ages named for service directly useful to the State in the defence, the promotion of public safety, the conservation of the State's resources, or the construction and maintenance of public improvements." The boy, in other words, as he applies himself to these selected tasks of industrial service is to regard himself as an enlisted soldier under orders to defend his country by his hands or brains, if not by his sword.

How far this new conception of an industrial army is to lead us; whether the forms of militarism are to be universally accepted in our social order; whether, as has been lately said, " We can fight Germany only by reconstructing the United States," and " must adopt by a swift conversion the virtues which have been neglected in time of peace "; [1] whether, in short, we are to follow the lead of Great Britain in that vast expansion of governmental Socialism, of which theorists have hitherto conceived, but which has now been enforced with a rigor of which the most sanguine agitators could not have dreamed,— all this is as yet undetermined. It may be that the tradition of individualism, which has been so dominant in the United

[1] *New Republic*, April 21, 1917, p. 337.

States, will restrict the sphere of centralized control, or may suggest some middle path in which individual initiative and governmental guarantees may work hand in hand. Whatever may be the practical adjustment of these relations between the citizen and the State in the various occupations essential for national defence, this at least seems a not remote possibility: that every young American shall be consciously doing, or learning to do, something for his country, and be counted as a soldier enlisted for national defence. That would be, if not a complete conversion of militarism, yet a recognition that moral equivalents for war exist. Indeed, it might come to pass that a country, which in this soldierly spirit applied itself to organized efficiency in the arts of peace, would find that its industrial impregnability had secured it from foreign attack, and that the application of militarism to industry had rendered superfluous its application to war.

Such are some of the dramatic possibilities which may meet the United States as it gropes its way through the dark contingencies of its Valley of Decision to the future which is as yet unrevealed. It may be that militarism has much to teach to so undisciplined and light-minded a people. It may be that a new era

of public and private responsibility is not far away. It may be that by such enlistment with the allies of righteousness the prophecy of William James may be verified, and "war may become absurd and impossible for its own monstrosity," that soldierliness may be spiritualized, and the wars of the future fought, "not against flesh and blood, but against the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

There remains, however, another aspect of this conversion of militarism which these speculations about the future must not lead one to forget. Interesting as it may be to contemplate the possibility of conscription applied to industry, it must be admitted that this regeneration of the world by forced draft is not likely to occur without delay. It is not unlike those Utopian anticipations of a perfect commonwealth which have haunted the minds of social philosophers from Sir Thomas More to Edward Bellamy, but which have been more successful in literature than in life. The tremendous exigencies of war may encourage a temporary consent to this enormous extension of governmental authority; but with the return of peace the inclination in the American character for free initiative may reassert itself. A system of conscrip-

tion does not as yet present to the American mind an alluring picture of the future of democracy.

But how is it meantime with life as it now is, and with the ordinary vocations of a world at peace? Must the conversion of militarism wait for conscription? Is there no chance for the heroic life until young men are compelled to lead it? Are there not risks as dramatic, and sacrifices as splendid, confronting young men in the ordinary callings of modern life as are now meeting soldiers in the trenches? Is not, in short, the conversion of militarism actually illustrated in the daily duties of common men, who may be quite unaware that they are enlisted as soldiers, and whose heroism may be disguised by the undramatic appearance of their tasks? To reassure oneself of this soldierliness already applied to works of peace would be to regain one's faith in the American character, and even to promote the hope that heroism by conscription may be some day succeeded by the unconstrained heroism of citizenship. In Professor James's prophecy he makes a passing allusion to this voluntary system of soldierliness. "The martial type," he says, "can be bred without war. Priests and medical men are in a fashion educated to it." Is there not in

this allusion the suggestion of a general truth? Is not the martial type more widely distributed than is generally observed? May not any calling be dignified by the discipline and sacrifices of soldierliness? Are not, in fact, great numbers of lives actually, even though unconsciously, enlisted in this moral militarism:

> "Glad hearts, without reproach or blot,
> Who do Thy work and know it not."

The most obvious instance of this converted heroism is one of those to which Professor James refers. A practising physician goes his way, earning his living and serving his community, with little thought that he is a hero; yet the most modest doctor may be called, any day, to risks and ventures as perilous as in a crisis of war. An epidemic sweeps through the town, scourging its homes with some infectious disease; and while the flags of alarm are hung before the house-doors, and the neighbors hurry by, the doctor does not for a moment hesitate or retreat. It is a part of his daily work to enter and serve, and he proceeds with his task without thinking of himself or being regarded by his neighbors as a soldier.

A little girl, for example, is brought into a hospital, suffering from diphtheria, and a tube

is inserted in her throat to relieve the breathing. The tube becomes clogged, and a young medical assistant without an instant's hesitation puts his own mouth to the tube, sucks away the membrane, and dies of diphtheria himself. It is simply a risk involved in his professional duty, the conversion of the military instinct from the taking of life to the saving of it.

A more distinguished illustration of this professional heroism was offered in the war against yellow fever. This dread disease had throughout the history of the United States ravaged its Southern communities. Ninety-five epidemics had occurred during the nineteenth century. Then, in the year 1900, three assistant-surgeons of the United States Army, with some enlisted men, undertook to determine whether the disease was conveyed by contagion or by some insect-carrier. They exposed themselves to infection, but without harm. Then with scientific tranquillity they permitted mosquitoes, which had previously fed on yellow-fever patients, to bite them. One of the surgeons died; and two of the private soldiers developed the disease, and on recovery refused all pecuniary reward, exhibiting, as their commander said, "a moral courage never surpassed in the annals of the army of the United States." It was an achieve-

ment of soldierliness to be ranked with the greatest victories of war. The vast enterprise of the Panama Canal is as much a result of freeing the Isthmus from yellow-fever as of engineering skill, and as truly a monument of Assistant-Surgeons Reed and Lazear as of General Goethals and General Gorgas. Of Reed it was said by General Wood, "I know no man who has done so much for humanity"; and on the monument to Lazear are the words, "With more than the courage of a soldier he risked and lost his life to show how the ravages of a fearful pestilence might be prevented."

Such is the soldierliness of science. And there is a further quality in it which increases its heroism. It is the absence of publicity or applause. The courage of the soldier is sustained by companionship; he feels the touch of elbows; he anticipates glory, promotion, a decoration on his breast. But the heroism of science may have no companionship but a microscope, and the risks it encounters may be but a part of daily routine. A medical missionary at a station in central China was waylaid by the Boxers, and in defending his wife was slashed on the arm and leg. He was carried two days in a cart to the river and to the coast, and then to England, where the tendons of his wrist were

sewed. Forthwith he and his wife, without hesitation or consciousness of merit, quietly returned to their station and proceeded with the healing of the very men who had attacked and wounded him. Does not such conduct deserve to be called soldierly? May it not be as brave to cure as it is to kill? Are not dirt and ignorance, stupidity and cowardice, as firmly entrenched and as hard to dislodge as a battery behind barbed wire? If it needs courage to take up the sword, may it not take equal courage to take up the sword of the spirit? Is it not time, then, that the possibilities of peace, the drama of routine, the risks of daily duty, were accepted as fields for heroism, and that the great names of modern history should be, not alone of those who have desolated countries and slaughtered enemies, but of those who by creative sacrifice have earned promotion in the armies of peace?

Nor is this soldierliness a monopoly of professional or distinguished men alone. The same story may be told of very humble ways of service and in the most commonplace of lives. A steel-worker sweating before his furnace; a locomotive engineer holding his throttle and peering out into the night; a miner groping his way through poisonous fumes; a mother bend-

ing over her sick child,— these are not unusual occurrences; but so familiar that one may overlook their nobility and turn elsewhere for heroes or saints. Some workmen were resting one day in the noon-hour at a steel-plant, when a young Irishman named Lacy noticed that a rivet in the waste-gas pipe was giving way. "Get out, boys," cried Lacy, "I'll hold it back." But one of his companions turned to help him. It was Peter Moncilochi, an old man and an Italian. Both of them collapsed, while their twenty-three companions escaped; and the Irish boy and the Italian veteran verified together the soldierly saying, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Such incidents are, indeed, quite as likely to occur among plain people as among those whose luxury and comfort have tempted them to think first of themselves. Much kindly service is offered by the prosperous to the poor, and blesses both those who give and those who take; but for pure and self-forgetful tenderheartedness one may turn with confidence to those who have little to give except neighborliness, time and sympathy. A baby lies sick in the tenement, and both parents must work all day. The visitor from the Settlement gives

what help she can through the day, but the strain is at night, when the parents must sleep or lose their job. So the neighbors in the tenement take turns in watching, and with no sense of sacrifice the rough-handed men take the hard hours of dawn and then steal away to their work.

In short, there is hidden away in the most prosaic lives a fund, larger than they themselves are apt to know, of moral capital which can be drawn on when needed, and which enriches and sustains their self-respect. To utilize that deposit of magnanimity, to enlist in that army of self-effacing service, to find an outlet for soldierliness in mercy instead of murder,—that is the great discovery which the world must make if it is to satisfy those instincts which have hitherto expressed themselves in war. It may be urged that this also, like Professor James's plan of conscription, is a Utopian scheme of social morality; but the lessons of the present time are teaching us that one or the other of two difficult alternatives must be chosen: either the attempting of the apparently impossible or the submitting to the positively unendurable. As an English student of the war has said: "The enemy of all our peace is the man who by word or tone or gesture depresses hope, or

defers Utopia to a distant future. . . . This war has taught us that our choice lies between Utopia and Hell." [1]

Such, then, is the conversion of militarism, the transmutation of the virtues of the soldier into their spiritual equivalents. Even in the world as it now is, much degraded by self-seeking, overshadowed by the terrors of war, and even without recourse to social or governmental compulsion, there is already possible a magnanimity of common life, a constructive soldierliness, which may perpetuate the "hardihood" of the fighter without the stain of blood. The spirit of militarism cannot be extirpated, but it can be converted, and that conversion of militarism is the cause which, after the call to arms has been obeyed, will summon the future to a new Crusade.

In such a view of life there is, however, more than a new ethics or a finer patriotism. When one speaks of a crusade, he remembers the cross of Christ, and finds himself describing a religious not less than a moral conversion. The new demand is not only laid on an American as a citizen, but it is also a part of his religious education. For when one

[1] H. N. Brailsford, *The War of Steel and Gold*, Macmillan, 1915, p. 332.

turns back from these lessons of war to the teaching of the New Testament, he finds that this same translation of the soldier's habit of mind into the language of faith is one of the most characteristic aspects of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It is often asked in these days whether Jesus was for peace at any price; and many Christian disciples have accepted the ideal of a submissive, resigned and non-resistant Christ. Yet it is only necessary to recall the preceding chapters of this little book, in which religious education has been repeatedly brought face to face with the teaching of Jesus, in order to correct this superficial impression. Discipline, Power, Perspective,— these are attributes not of weakness but of strength. It is true that Jesus was a sufferer; but it is not less true that he was a soldier. He surrendered much in order to conquer more. He could send his disciples forth without purse or scrip; but again he could say, "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one." Prince of Peace as he was, he scourged the traders, he defied the Pharisees, he rebuked Pilate on his throne, and he died for a cause that seemed lost, as a soldier dies in a charge. When the Apostle Paul described the Christian life, he also was led to use the language of militarism. "To

war a good warfare"; "to fight a good fight of faith"; "to be a good soldier of Jesus Christ"; that "one might please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier,"— such was the Apostolic definition of discipleship.

In a word, the teaching of the New Testament concerning the conduct of life finds its dominant note in that spiritualization of soldierliness and Christianization of courage, which accomplish the conversion of militarism. "I am not come," said Jesus, "to destroy, but to fulfil." That was his way with all the impulses and habits of life which had in them the possibility of good. He came, not to destroy the fighting instinct, but to fulfil it; not to rob life of heroism, but to give a new scope and significance to the heroic life; not to proclaim a moral disarmament, but to bid his followers put on the whole armor of God; to mobilize the forces of righteousness and call them to the colors of God. That is the New Testament way of delivery from the horrors of war. Permanent emancipation from the militarism which kills must be secured through the conversion of militarism for the campaigns which save.

# XII

## THE PLACE OF JESUS CHRIST IN A RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

EACH step in this series of reflections on religious education brings one nearer to a single personality and influence. It is as though one's thought had revolved in the circumference of life, and was finally drawn as by some law of spiritual attraction toward a single centre. Each line of discussion or description, as it has been followed to its interior meaning, has led to some aspect of the teaching or example of Jesus Christ. Not as a theological assumption or as an ecclesiastical demand, but as a logical and inevitable point toward which all these various considerations move, as one passes from the circle of his thought to its centre, there is rediscovered the interpretative power of that teaching; and one's own conclusions converge from their various interests on that interior authority.

It may indeed happen that these radii of communication are followed outward rather than inward. A life may enter, first of all, into inti

macy with Jesus Christ, and then from that centre proceed along one or another line of thought or action until it reach the circumference of the modern world. The great majority of Christian disciples have undoubtedly gone this way. The teaching of their Master has moulded their own lives, and then the world and its problems have become interpretable and significant. Either way, however, whether it be of deduction from the influence of Jesus Christ, or induction from the conduct of life, brings one — if it be followed through — to the same result. That which Christianizes religious education is the bond between circumference and centre. Let the radius be straight and bind the two ends together, and one may go inward or outward with the same assurance. A modern life, as it interprets its own problems, is led inward to the teaching of Jesus; and the teaching of Jesus, followed outward, brings one to his immediate duty in the modern world. The road between Christian loyalty and moral efficiency is not a "one-way street." It is a high-road, which one may travel either way. It is not so important to determine where to start, as it is to find the Way. Jesus Christ may be either the beginning of a religious experience, or the end of it. The religious educa-

tion of an American citizen is not a fixed curriculum, but an elective system.

As, therefore, at the end of this series of chapters, the personality of Jesus Christ comes into clearer view, and its place in a religious experience is to be determined, it is not essential that this place should be defined for all time and for all men in the same terms, or approached by all in the same way. It is not a question of orthodox Christology, but of personal intimacy. It is not necessary to prescribe how that intimacy shall be reached, if only it be reached at all. Whether light shall reach the eye directly or by reflection is not important so long as one has light enough to see. Whether the Way leads from life to faith or from faith to life is not important so long as the Way is found and followed. All that one can offer of guidance to another is to tell which way he has been led and to report that the path is open. In short, the place of Jesus Christ in a religious experience is not necessarily fixed where the theologians affirm that it should be, but rather at that point where in the actual course of life it has been in reality found. It is a matter not for profession, but for confession. If one is to speak at all of so intimate and personal a relationship, he must

abandon argument and turn to testimony. His Christian confession must be an *Apologia pro vita sua.*

Such an *Apologia* may begin by recalling what religion means, and what are the various types of religious experience which may be described or defined. Three functions of consciousness, the philosophers tell us,— Thought Feeling, and Will — though intermingling and co-operative in their operations, may be, in theory at least, discriminated; and each of the three has seemed to many students the seat of the religious life. The Rationalist defines religion in terms of the reason; he thinks God's thoughts after Him. Religion, he repeats with Hegel, is "the finite spirit's knowledge of its own consciousness as Absolute Spirit." The penetration of the Reason through the contradictions of the finite world to the unity of the Absolute Spirit is a direct assurance to a being whose peculiar nature is found in his rational life. The Mystic, on the other hand, discovers a depth and universality in the realm of feeling which delivers him from the aristocracy of the rationalist and associates him with the democracy of the emotional life. "The measure of knowledge," he says with Schleiermacher, "is not the measure of piety." "Your feeling, in

so far as it expresses the universal life you share, is your religion." Finally, there enters into this great debate the teaching of the Ethical Idealist, recalling attention to the function of the will, and finding a way to God through the sense of obligation and obedience. The Categorical Imperative of Kant, which compels his reverence for the moral law as for the stars in the heavens; the voice of conscience which Fichte heard in the soul "as the channel through which God's influence descends on man"; the "great redemption,"— to use Martineau's words,—"which converts the life of duty into the life of love,"— all these doctrines of ethical philosophy open a third path, which runs through conscience to conviction, through decision to insight, through loyalty to piety, and makes of obedience, as Robertson said, an "organ of spiritual knowledge."

When one turns from these divisive and often contentious conclusions of the philosophers to the teaching of Jesus Christ, the first thing which impresses one is its many-sidedness and universality. All three of these sects of philosophy, the rationalists, the mystics, and the moral idealists, find their doctrines anticipated and confirmed in the word and work of Jesus. The reach and depth of his thought, his intellectual

attitude toward the Eternal, his insight into nature and beauty, into fallacious reasoning and the significance of the insignificant, would have given him a place among the world's greatest thinkers if another destiny had not awaited him. "Ye shall know the truth," he says, in words which remain the supreme maxim of the rationalist, "and the truth shall make you free." "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Sayings like these commend the Teacher to that great number of inquirers in all centuries since who have looked for a rational interpretation of the life of God in the mind of man.

Yet not less reassuring is the story of Jesus to the experience of the mystic. The descent of the Holy Spirit upon the maturing soul; the immediate communion with God; the intuitive vision; the transfiguration of experience: all these marks of the ministry of Jesus illustrate what the literature of mysticism calls the "illuminated life" or the "transcendental consciousness," which reappears in religious history all the way from St. Francis to George Fox. Each monastic vision or mediæval ecstasy, each contemplative quietude or emotional revival which Christian history recalls, has been fortified by the emotional intimacy of the

heart of Jesus with the Heart of the world.

There remains, however, that aspect of the Gospels of which neither the rationalist nor the mystic takes adequate account. It is the dedication of the will of Jesus to do the will of Him that sent him, and his summons to discipline, power and decision. Here, beyond dispute, was the fundamental note of the gospel of Christ. Great disclosures of truth were made by him to the reason, great exaltations of the emotions mark the crises of his career: but the first call of Jesus to his disciples was not to a Christological definition or to a transcendental vision, but to an ethical decision, a practical discipleship, a dedication of the will. "Follow me," he says, "take up thy cross, and follow." "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" The Sermon on the Mount is a discourse of practical ethics, a searching of the will, a judgment of conduct. "By their fruits ye shall know them." "Depart from me, ye that work iniquity."

In this teaching there may not be the profoundest part of the Gospel, or even to many

minds its most appealing message. The satisfaction of the reason may be a deeper, and the illumination of the emotions a richer, fulfilment of man's communion with God. Ethical loyalty may be too obvious and unsophisticated to satisfy those who crave an exceptional, esoteric, or privileged admission to the religious life. The Sermon on the Mount may be to many readers less sublime than the Gospel of John. Yet it is evident that the primary test of discipleship is in the discipline of the will. Not theological orthodoxy or mystic illumination, but the spiritualization and purification of conduct are the essence of the Christian gospel. The primary organ of religious education is the Will.

What, then, is the meaning of this diversity of impression which may be derived from the single life of Jesus? Must it be maintained that a choice should be made between these different views? Is the record so ambiguous that Christians are involved in an unending debate concerning the terms of discipleship? Is Christ divided? On the contrary, it is precisely at this point that one comes into view of the richness and comprehensiveness of the Gospel. Jesus is too many-sided in his influence to be interpreted by a single psychological principle. He is equally accessible to the mind, the emotions and

the will. The rationalist, the mystic, and the idealist find themselves on converging paths as they approach him. The finest subtlety of thought is encouraged by the mysteries of Christology; the highest vision of the mystic is anticipated in the experience of Jesus; the moral idealism of conduct is the condition of discipleship. The Christian life is not partial, departmental, segregated; but comprehensive, integral, complete. It invites all the faculties of the spiritual life to co-operate in its interpretation. It sees things steadily and sees them whole.

These hasty reflections on the psychology of religion, and on the relation of the personality of Jesus to its various types, open the way for a personal confession, which may not reproduce what is invariable, or even what is normal, in the history of a soul; but which may suggest something of the rich diversity of operations which the one Spirit may employ. Is it not possible, and indeed probable, that in the course of a religious experience of many years one may be permitted to try in succession all three of these ways of approach to Christian discipleship which have been abstractly described?

A youthful mind, waked by the influence of parents, preachers, and teachers to thoughts about religion, is likely to be immediately con-

fronted by theological definitions and denominational differences, and to attempt at once its own intellectual adjustment. The period when childhood passes into youth is one of mental as well as physical puberty. The boy is temperamentally a rationalist. Religion is as yet largely unassimilated and external. It comes to him from the pulpit, from books, from teachers, and he demands of it the evidence of reality and consistency. He asks more questions than the wisest can answer. He treasures the text: "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." He has the self-confidence of a primitive intellectualism.

Then by a transition which is at once physical, intellectual, and spiritual, through the enrichment of experience, the appeal of poetry, the appreciation of beauty, the enjoyment of the universe, the youth may be led into the Mystic Way. The great and lovely company of those who have found God through immediate communion, from the Apostle John to the Apostle Emerson, call him to their companionship and emancipate him from the bonds of rationalism. Supreme among the mystics is the same Jesus whose nature he had tried so crudely to depict; and discipleship becomes emotionally revived and confirmed. The range of religious

fellowship extends itself. The modern mysticism of Martineau becomes verified by the mediæval mysticism of Tauler and the *Theologia Germanica*. Fox's "Journal" speaks the same language as Browning's "Christmas Eve." Emerson speaks to his new disciples: "Within man is the soul of the Holy, the wise Silence, the universal Beauty, the Eternal One." Channing and Martineau reveal themselves, behind their contributions to theology, as at heart mystics. Of the first it was said by a kindred spirit in England: "The master-light of all his seeing was the spiritual relation of himself and of every man to God"; and Martineau, in a rare moment of self-confession, wrote of himself: "Steeped in empirical and necessarian modes of thought I served out successive terms of willing captivity to Locke and Hartley, to Collins, Edwards and Priestley, to Bentham and James Mill, and became a logical prig in whom I am humbled to recognize myself." Very remote from this early rationalism was the permanent abiding-place of Martineau's lofty spirit. He set, as he said, "his affirmation of God, not on the shifting alluvial slope of history, but on the rooted rock which belongs to the structure of the world." "There is," he added, "a close affinity, perhaps identity, between religion and

poetry." Historian and metaphysician as he was, his final place in the history of thought is secured by his reiterated confession of direct and immediate communion of the life of man with the Spirit of God. No religious experience, it may be safely said, is likely to be adequate or secure, unless at some point in its spiritual evolution it recognizes its affinity with the great company — Christian and extra-Christian — who have walked firmly,— and often with great solitariness of spirit,— along the Mystic Way.

How, or when, it shall happen that a further transition from rationalism and mysticism to a third period of religious experience may occur, it is difficult to anticipate or determine. Perhaps the physiological processes of advancing age may bring with them a decreasing confidence in reasoning and a slackening of emotional vitality. Perhaps, on the other hand, the larger experience of life may make one less confident in argument and less dominated by feeling. Whatever may have been the causes of the transition, it has happened to so many lives as to be reasonably regarded as a normal and trustworthy change, that as the personality of Jesus reasserts its claim to the loyalty of later years, one finds himself less concerned either

for theological precision or for mystic exaltation, and more conscious of the primary demand of Jesus for the dedication of the will, the discipline of duty, the education of conscience, the elementary summons: "Follow me; take up thy cross and follow."

As one thus surveys the theological disputations of the modern world, he finds himself, not indeed failing in animated interest for a rational creed, but impressed with the limitations of its consequences. It becomes obvious that one might with entire conviction assent to all the articles of all the creeds and not be a Christian. Not one of the historic creeds of the Church pledges a disciple to a consistent Christian life. One might accept all their majestic propositions without committing himself to honor or chastity or self-sacrifice. One might believe in the Virgin birth of Jesus without being thereby constrained to be born again. One might believe in the resurrection of the body as a miracle without presenting his own body as a living sacrifice. The creeds represent the intellectual struggle of centuries, not so much to create discipleship, as to interpret it. They are an effort of the reason to trudge with patient steps along the way which the wings of the will have covered in an unhindered flight.

One may expect, therefore, diversity in the creeds. He has no controversy with any. They are the best which the human mind has achieved in its interpretation of God and man. He claims fellowship with all. He believes in the Holy Catholic Church and in the Communion of Saints. But to confuse intellectual definition with personal dedication; to substitute dogma for life, or sacrament for sacrifice, or institutional Christianity for personal religion, is, it now seems to him, to miss the fundamental note of the Gospel of Christ, and to hear again the solemn irony of Jesus: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Is it not precisely this intellectualized conception of Christianity which has now reached its awful Nemesis in Europe? Christianity as an institution, an organization, a political factor, a State within a State, has had full control of every nation in western Europe; and it has proved impotent to check the madness of militarism. It may be confidently maintained that the religion of external dictation, dogmatic authority, and governmental oversight, has reached the end of its influence on the lives of thoughtful men. Yet nothing is more obvious than the fact that a new necessity and oppor-

tunity has arrived for the religion of the Will. The voice of the Church may be silenced; but the call of Jesus is heard as never before. The nations have put a social institution in the place of a social consecration; they have trusted a hierarchy instead of a higher morality; and the failure of Christianity as a form of government may be the disclosure some day — God grant it may be soon! — of Christianity as a way of life.

If, however, the religion of dogma becomes inadequate to support the experiences of one's later years, neither can one find the place of Jesus in mystic communion alone. We hear much in these days of the subordination of the Teacher of Nazareth to the vision of an Eternal Christ. We are told that the kernel of the New Testament is to be found, not in the plain narrative of the Synoptic Gospels, but in the emotional exaltation reported in the Epistles. The Gospels, it is said, "exhibit an incomplete situation, a raw audience, and an inchoate context of evidence." "It is in the Epistles that we have the essence of Christianity." Is it not obvious that this neo-Christian mysticism defeats its own purpose? Does it not sacrifice historicity to orthodoxy, and in order to understand Jesus maintain, with dubious loyalty, that Jesus

did not understand himself? Mystical communion with the Eternal Christ may, it is true, be a support of self-sacrificing discipleship; but the same emotion may be — and often has been — a way of refuge from immediate duty, a self-indulgent monasticism, or even a sensual delight. The justification of Christian mysticism, as of Christian theology, must be found in its ethical efficiency.

One is brought, then, as his life is prolonged, to what may seem a most elementary confession concerning the place which Jesus finally holds in a religious experience; yet it is the place which he himself in many of his most characteristic sayings seems to accept. "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord," he says, "and do not the things which I say?" "Many will say to me, . . . Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? . . . and then will I profess unto them, I never knew you." "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock." "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my

brother, and my sister, and my mother." How simple, how uncomplicated, how universally practicable, is the way thus opened before a modern life! How strange it seems that any other test of fellowship should ever have been regarded as essential or as sufficient! Here is room for a discipleship of Jesus which is not dependent on theological orthodoxy, or reserved for mystical illumination, but which is accessible to wise and simple alike, to the child's first experiments in obedience and the old man's final summary of life. Here is a habit of mind which does not deny or depreciate either thinking or feeling, but finds in them the instruments and interpreters of loyalty. Here is the plain, though steep and stony, path of personal consecration; the welcome of the promise that he who has the will to do the will shall know of the teaching.

And is it said that this is too elementary a relationship to be the fulfilment of a religious life; that it marks the beginning rather than the end of Christian experience; that it indicates, not a growth to maturity but rather a reversion to second childhood? On the contrary, the final satisfaction in this transition from a dogmatic or a mystical discipleship is in its restoration of reality, its sim-

plification of the religious life, its emergence from the perplexing paths of theology and the slippery foothold of mysticism to a standing-ground of assurance and efficiency, the conversion of faith from a dogma or a feeling to an attitude of the will. It is, no doubt, to issue at the end where one began, in the simple answer to the initial summons: "Follow me"; but that answer of the will is now amplified and enriched by all the experiences of life, by joys and sorrows, by disasters and disciplines, by disappointments and dreams, so that the following is at once harder and easier, more complex in its demands yet more compelling in its persuasion. One can wait for further disclosures to the reason, and for more intimate emotional communion with the mysteries of God, if only the way one should go is plain and the wandering from it less alluring.

I have spoken of this approach to Christian experience as the ascending of a hill from various sides. That, however, is not a true picture; for the path upward is continuous and one; a winding way, a spiral ascent, up which the Guide encourages one to go, from the first dedication of the will, rising to successive points of intellectual clarification and emotional exaltation, but brought round again,

as one climbs, to the same point at which the path began, only higher up, with a broader prospect and a less clouded view. The process is life-long; but its horizon widens and at the end the view of the whole of life lies at one's feet. Below there was much underbrush of contention and doubt, much missing of the way in intellectual darkness or in mystic fog. Above there is a clearer sky, and the diverse creeds take their places in the landscape of thought, and the mists of mysticism soften the view; and however humbled one may be by failure to reach the real summit, and however clearly he sees above him higher heights of unattained loyalty, he at least feels about him the tranquillity and exhilaration of the upper air; and the Friend whom he has followed points, out beyond the controversies of the theologians and the visions of the mystics, the far Country, now plainly visible, to which runs the straight, though long and rugged, road of a Religious Education.

Printed in the United States of America.

THE following pages contain advertisements of Macmillan books by the same author or on kindred subjects.

*BY THE SAME AUTHOR*

# The Approach to the Social Question

## AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF SOCIAL ETHICS

*Decorated cloth covers, gilt top, $1.25. Macmillan Standard Library, $.50*

"Like the City of God in the book of Revelation, the Social Question lies four-square and toward each front leads a well-travelled road. Each of these four approaches to the social question has been trodden by many students and there are aspects of the social question which may be best seen from each of these converging roads. The first of these approaches is by the way of social science; the second is by the way of sociology; the third is by the way of economics; the fourth is by the way of ethics."

In this highly engaging manner the author sets forth the ways which lead to a philosophy of the Social Question as he sees them and then by considering each one of these ways, he proceeds to a final recognition of the religious significance of the questions which are vexing the society of to-day.

"To say that Professor Peabody has written this book in his maturity is to say that it is marked by reverence, penetration, thorough scholarship, broad vision, and the spirit of Jesus Christ. . . . It is a valuable contribution to a great cause."—*Christian Advocate.*

". . . written in the delightful style for which Dr. Peabody is well known. . . . One of the best volumes which that balanced and devout thinker has given to the public."—*Expositor.*

---

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
**Publishers 64–66 Fifth Avenue New York**

*BY THE SAME AUTHOR*

## Jesus Christ and the Christian Character

*Cloth, 12mo, $1.50, Standard Library, $.50*

"One of the most striking features of modern addresses and sermons is their practical character. The day has gone by when Christianity was thought to be a matter of dogma chiefly. It is being realized more and more clearly that the Christian calling is one to 'follow His steps.' This is set forth very emphatically in one of the most remarkable books in religious literature. . . . A study of Christian ethics which is full of power and truly inspiring."—*The Independent.*

## The Religion of an Educated Man

*Cloth, 12mo, $1.00*

"A distinct contribution to a branch of literature of which we stand in great need, and we are confident that no one can read these earnest words of an experienced director without being spurred on to renewed effort for the realization of that finished product and veritable treasure — the true scholar — the man in whom all the faculties have been developed along harmonious and coördinate lines." —*Boston Transcript.*

## Jesus Christ and the Social Question

*Cloth, 12mo, $1.50, Standard Library, $.50*

An examination of the teaching of Jesus in its relation to some problems of modern social life.

---

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
**Publishers 64–66 Fifth Avenue New York**

# The Christian Life in the Modern World

By FRANCIS G. PEABODY

Author of "Jesus Christ and the Social Question," etc.

*Cloth, 12mo, $1.25*

The purpose of this book is to meet the increasing impression that Christian idealism is inapplicable to the conditions of modern life and to indicate the terms and conditions on which these ideals may be perpetuated. There are chapters on The Practicability of the Christian Life, The Christian Life and the Modern Family, The Christian Life and the Business World, The Christian Life and the Making of Money, The Christian Life and the Using of Money, The Christian Life and the Modern State and The Christian Life and the Christian Church.

"Dr. Peabody has always been so careful to publish a book only after the most conscientious preparation that a new volume from his pen is an occasion of pleasure to the reviewer. In addition, his attitude is that of genuine objectivity. He brings his best thought to his subject, and whether the conclusions are in harmony with those of other men, does not seem to enter his mind; he seems to be dominated by a passionate love for the truth."— *Boston Transcript.*

"Professor Francis G. Peabody's books on practical Christian problems have always a grip in them that causes the reader to stop and think of his own relation to such questions. His 'Christian Life in the Modern World' contains sane, clear, practical and deeply moving chapters on the social teachings and demands of Christianity, probing the defects in social life and raising the noblest ideals of service."— *The Independent.*

---

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64–66 Fifth Avenue New York

# God, the Invisible King

By H. G. WELLS

*12mo, $1.25*

MR. BRITLING SAW IT THROUGH BECAUSE HE DISCOVERED GOD!

Mr. Britling said:

"Religion is the first thing and the last thing, and until a man has found God and been found by God he begins at no beginning, he works to no end."

Mr. H. G. Wells' new book God, The Invisible King is the full religion of "Mr. Britling," the religion that has sprung up out of the ruins of the devastated countries of Europe and is now glowing in the hearts and minds of all Americans, giving us untold strength for heroism and courage for sacrifice.

Mr. Wells says:

"The time draws near when mankind will awake . . . and then there will be no nationality in all the world but humanity, and no king, no emperor, nor leader, but the one God of mankind."

---

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64–66 Fifth Avenue New York

BV4070.A1

Return this book on or before the last
date stamped below

LUTHERAN SEMINARY LIBRARY, MAYWOOD, ILL.